



THE LIBRARY
OF
THE UNIVERSITY
OF CALIFORNIA
LOS ANGELES

Digitized by the Internet Archive in 2007 with funding from Microsoft Corporation



AN INTERESTING

CONTROVERSY

WITH

MR. RITSCHEL, VICAR OF HEXHAM,

BY

THOMAS WARD,

AUTHOR OF

THE CANTOS AND THE ERRATA OF THE PROTESTANT BIBLE,

FROM THE ORIGINAL MANUSCRIPT.

Why shall we hesitate to throw ourselves upon the authority of the catholic church, which has always maintained herself by the succession of bishops, by the faith of the people, by the decision of councils, and by the authority of miracles? Not to acknowledge her doctrine, is a proof either of great impiety or extreme arrogance.

St. Augustine.

Manchester,

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY J. ROEINSON, 44, DEANSGATE, SOLD ALSO BY

LONGMAN AND CO.; SHERWOOD AND CO. PATERNOSTER-ROW; KEATING, BROWN AND KEATING, DUKE-STREET, GROSVENOR-SQUARE; BOOKER, NEW BOND-STREET, AND ANDREWS, DRAKE-STREET, RED LION-SQUARE, LONDON: BOLLAND, YORK; WHITTLE AND SHARROCK, PRESTON; HEATON, NEWCASTLE-UPON-TYNE; GILLOW AND LYNCH, LIVERPOOL, AND ALL OTHER BOOKSEL ERS.

1HAJ-war XDCC

CONTENTS.

BX 1780 W2171 1819

PART I.	
CHAPTER 1	11
CHAPTER 2 Whether the protest-	
ant church of England is the	
catholic church ? 2	26
PART II.	
CHAPTER 1.—Whether the protes-	
tant church of England is a part	
or true member of the catholic	
	0
CHAPTER 2.—Whether the protes-	U
tants of the church of England	
are as true catholics as ever lived	
	,
upon the face of the earth? 4. CHAPTER 3.—An examination of	9
some texts of scripture alledged	- 1
some texts of scripture alledged to prove the church of God to	
have been corrupted in faith be-	-
fore the coming of Christ 50	
CHAPTER 4.—Your ridiculous dis-	1
tinction, Mr. Ritschel, between	
a true church and a sound church	
considered; as also, your familiar	
examples of an infected man	1
and drossy gold.	
CHAPTER 5.—Mr. Rogers' proposi- tion that "the visible church	1
tion that "the visible church	
may and has erred in doctrine"	
by you owned, and by you con-	
tradicted 70	
CHAPTER 6.—That the protestants	
have made articles of faith, clearly demonstrated 78	
clearly demonstrated 78	
CHAPTER 7.—The protestant church	1
of England denounces her ana-	1
themas or excommunications	
against all such as deny this her	1
new ereed 98	17,
CHAPTER 8 The protestant church	1
of England holds communion	1
in faith with no other church in	
the whole world 102	
CHAPTER 9.—Where was the true	1
church of God, at the time when	1
you began your pretended refor- mation? and what public pro-	
fessors had she holding and teach-	
CHAPTER 10.—Evident from Mr.	L
Ritschel'swritings that the church	
of Rome is the true church of	
God—the catholic church 136	1
PART III.	
Charter 1—Some remarks upon	

certain particular passages in

PART I.

your letters which have little or no relation to the point of your being part of the catholic church. And first, upon what you write about the conversion of our English nation to christianity : secondly, upon your calumnies against St. Augustine; and thirdly, upon that epistle falsely pretended to have been sent from pope Eleutherius to king Lucius. 130 CRAPTER 2 .- An account of Jewel's challenge, and himself detected for a corruption of the primitive fathers' writings. CHAPTER 3.-The fable of a female pope, or the history of pope Joan detected for a ridiculous fiction. CHAPTER 4 .- Your examination of the tree of life is an evident demonstration of Mr. Ritschel's infidelity CHAPTER 5.—The account you give of your faith examined, together with your reason for rejecting pope Pius' profession of faith. - 188 CHAPTER C .- Whether the marks of God's church, by which she is noted in the apostles' and Nicene creeds, can properly be applied to, or agree with the protestant church of England CHAPTER 7 .- The Roman catholic church is the one, holy, catholic and apostolic church. POSTCRIPT. THE pope's supremacy and spiritual jurisdiction over the whole catholie or visible church on earth proved from sacred scripture and the primitive fathers. THE real presence of Christ's body and blood in the blessed sacrament of the cucharist, proved from holy scripture, and the testimonies of the primitive fathers. 238 LIMBO, purgatory and prayers for the dead, proved from holy seripture and the primitive fathers. 255 Invocation of saints and angels, and that they pray to God for us proved from holy scripture and the testimony of the primitive

fathers.

The Life

OF

MR. THOMAS WARD,

AUTHOR OF THE

Following Controversy.

THOMAS WARD was the son of a respectable farmer, and was born at Danby Castle, in the Moors of Yorkshire, on the 13th of April, 1652. The early part of his life passed away undistinguished from that of ordinary children, and nothing remarkable of him is known until his fourteenth year, when he was at Pickering School, giving the first indications of his genius, and excelling his brothers in his taste and knowledge of the classics. Here he was initiated in the first principles of arithmetic, geometry, and astronomy, in which sciences he became a great proficient. So much was his father pleased with his eldest son's early propensity to learning, and the abilities which he discovered, that he determined to rescue him from the obscurity of a country life, and destined him for one of the learned professions. Young Ward was accordingly offered his choice to become a clergyman, a physician, or a lawyer; but, with a mind already matured by study and thinking, he hesitatedand at length declined his father's offers. In the practice of the law he observed there were too many temptations to dishonesty, and he doubted his firmness to resist them. The profession of physic was repugnant to the delicacy of his feelings; and, as a clergyman, he feared that he might contribute more to the destruction than the salvation of his fellow-men. Thus, perhaps, a too fastidious nicety in his conscience and ideas, left him without a calling, and he entered into the world with very little prospects of a permanent subsistance.

About this time his talents and acquirements first began to introduce him into notice, and he accepted an invitation from a gentleman

of fortune to live with him as a companion, and tutor to his children. In this retreat he had an opportunity of following the partientar bias of his mind, and accordingly he bent himself with incredible application to the study of controversy, then the rage of the day. Church history, the ancient fathers, the scriptures, and the more modern catholic controversies, always occupied his literary hours; but he still found oecasional recreation and delight in poetry and the elassies. He read incessantly, but not with the frivolity of one who skims the surface, and seeks only to arm himself with subtilty and sophism for impertinent disputation; he read to enrich his mind, to correct his understanding, and improve his heart. To this serious disposition and habit of reflection must be attributed the change in his religious sentiments, which immediately took place. His father and all his family were protestants, and he himself was educated in hostility to eatholic opinions. His liberal and penetrating mindhowever, disdained to wear the trammels of prejudice, and he even shook off the authority of a parent, rather than remain a slave, contrary to conscience and conviction, to the false principles he had at first imbibed. He accordingly embraced the catholic faith, which, together with his marrying a young lady of the same persuasion, so highly incensed his father, that at his death, which happened soon after, he begueathed all he possessed to his protestant wife and ehildren. This disappointment and blasting of his hopes, with his consegment destitute situation, it might be expected would have produced envy and irritation on his part; but his was no ordinary mind, and, raising himself above every little consideration of self, in the enthusiasm of charity, he directed his whole endeavours to the conversion of his mother and family. Providence blessed his exertions. and he had the happiness of seeing himself united to them in faith as well as in affection. His own good life did not a little contribute to this; for his change of religion had an influence on his manners in general; and his irreproachable conduct, and sweetness of temper, gave him the character of being beloved by God and man. youth of uncertainty, disgnictude, and seperation from his family, succeeded the calm of domestic peace, and the security of competence. For some years he remained buried and contented in this domestic retirement; but his genius opening with age, and expand-

ing with increase of knowledge, began to be restless, and thirsted for universal information. Sated with books, he wished to know mankind; and, with this intention, having, with much entreaty, obtained his mother's and wife's consent, he left his own country, and passed over to France. In France he continued for some time, learning the manners and language of the people; thence he went into Italy, and settled himself at Rome. In this famous city, the wreck and monument of ancient greatness, he had a wide range to gratify his taste to contemplate the fallen and mutilated glories of the ancient arts: he was continually in the churches, the public buildings, and public libraries, and spent a great portion of his time particularly in the Vatican. Here he had an opportunity of seeing some of the best documents respecting the history of England, from which he did not neglect to make numerous and useful quotations.— Controversy again became his favonrite study, which was soon interrupted by his accepting a commission in the Pope's guards, in which he remained five or six years, during which time he served in the maritime war against the Turks. His military career ended with the war, and he returned to England, at the pressing solicitations of his wife and relations, in the 34th year of his age. On his arrival, he was patronized and received on terms of friendship by Lords Derwentwater and Lumney, Col. Thomas Radcliff, Mr. Thornton, and others, to whom he was recommended by his learning, his wit, and a snavity of manners peculiarly his own. About this period he set about writing his Errata to the Protestant Bible, which was publishedinth e year 1688. His Monomachia, or Duel with Dr. Tillotson, appeared next, but anonymously; which made Dr. Tillotson observe, that it must have been written by some able Jesuit, not imagining so much force of argument and ecclesiastical research could be possessed by a layman. His Tree of Life, an ingenious device, presenting at one view an epitome of church history, according to the most exact chronology; his Controversy of ordinations truly stated; his Controversy with Mr. Ritchel, Minister of Hexham; his Notes on the 39 Articles and the Book of Homilies, all followed one another in rapid succession. Soon after appeared his burlesque poem on England's Reformation, commonly called his Cantos, in which he imitates Butler with considerable success. The

notes to this poem collected from the most approved historians, as Stow, Camden, Speed, Baker, Burnet, Heylin, Clarendon, &c. form a complete History of ecclesiastical affairs in England, from Henry the Eight's time to the end of Oates's plot. This was the last publication that came from the pen of Mr. Ward, though he afterwards compiled and wrote the History of England.* It is much to be regretted, that a coincidence of untoward circumstances, and particularly, his being obliged to fly the country and go over to France, prevented this work from being ever given to the world: the documents for it were collected by him with great diligence, and he himself esteemed it his best production. He died in the 56th year of his age, anno 1708, and was buried at St. Germain's in France, where his obsequies were performed with a solemnity becoming so pions and learned a man; leaving one son and three daughters; whereof two of the latter were married, and the third died a nun at Brussels.

^{*} It is stated that Mr. Ward had it in agitation to continue his poem down to the period of the revolution; and, previous to his death, had commenced another Canto. His intentions, likewise, were to review and publish what he had written, to add some things, and blot out others. Of the latter description, was the dialogue between Henry VIII. and queen Elizabeth. The author also, out of too much modesty and deference to a gentleman well skilled in the serious part of poetry, suffered him to erase and insert what words be thought proper: who, by foisting grave words and expressions in the place of ludicrons ones, considerably diminished the gaiety of the design. For instance, he had such a dread of the word sprite, that he always put spirit in its place, though it made a material alteration in the measure of the rhyme.

Publisher's Preface.

THE hand of oppression has been so long raised to banish eatholicity from the British soil, and the pulpit and the press have, with the same view, been the vehicles of so many gross abuses of its sacred tenets, that the memories, not only of those who have suffered persecution and death in its defence, but of such, too, as have advocated its cause by their writings, must be held in eternal veneration by every sineere and pious catholic. the long list of champions, who, since the pretented reformation in this kingdom, have entered the field of controversy to shield the religion of our forefathers from the attacks of protestantism, the author of the following pages holds too distinguished a place for a doubt to be entertained as to the reception they will meet with from the catholic public. As long as history shall record that the impetuous passion of the last of our Henrys made him withdraw this country from its spiritual subjection to the see of Rome, and that Elizabeth, the offspring of his adultery, caused her parliament to sanction the articles of a new creed, and to style herself Head of the Church; as long as it shall be known that penal laws subjected a catholic of the British empire to the severest penalties and made a priest liable to be hanged, drawn and quartered; so long will it be recorded that Mr. Ward, a layman, and a convert from the new religion, stood forth as one of the ablest and most celebrated controvertists, who have advocated the eause of eatholieity and exposed the fallaey of protestantism.

The work, which is here offered to the public, was occasioned by a personal interview, between the author, and Mr. Ritschel, vicar of Hexham, on the subject of religion. The particulars of this interview Mr. Ward laid before the world in a book entitled A conference with Mr Ritschel, vicar of Hexham. Mr. Ritschel replied: answers were exchanged on either side; and the following pages are what Mr. W. wrote in reply to the second letter of the viear of Hexham.

The point at issue between the contending parties was, whether the established church of England, or that of Rome, be the true church of Christ—the catholic church. The present production is in the form of an epistle and consists of three parts. In the first, Mr. Ward undertakes to prove that the method proposed by his opponent of finding out the true church is fallacious. The object of the second is to shew that the protestant is not so much as a part of the catholic church. The last commences with some remarks upon certain passages in the letters of Mr. R. which have no immediate connexion with the main point in question, together with a refutation of some calumnies thrown by protestants upon the eatholic church, and concludes with a comparative view of the repeetive claims of the two churches to the four marks of unity, sanctity, catholicity and apostolicity. To the letter is subjoined a posteript, in which the reader will find the important questions of the pope's suprrmacy, the real presence, purgatory and the invocation of saints, proved in the most ample and satisfactory manner from the written word of God and the concurring testimonies of the holy fathers. But, although what are mentioned constitute the prominent features of this work, it may, on the whole, be regarded as a compleat body of controversy, there being

scarcely a single point, wherein the two churches of England and Rome are at variance, on which the author does not treat.

The productions of some more recent controvertists may perhaps display a neatness and correctness of style which those of Mr. Ward do not possess, but in force of argument and perspicitly of expression he cannot be surpassed. His reasoning must carry with it conviction to the mind of every impartial and dispationate reader, and upon obstinacy itself it must impose silence.

Should it be objected to the following pages, that in many parts the language is calculated to give offence rather than to conciliate and that it is interspersed with sarcasms which can only wound the feelings without convincing the understanding; let it be remembered by whom such language was provoked. Let the expressions of Mr. Ward be compared with the insults, and (what is worse) the repeated calumnies of the adversaries of the catholic church, and ample apology will be discovered for all that he has written either harsh or sareastic. Can it be expected that the eatholie, who feels within himself the most intimate conviction of the high superiority which his religion possesses over all the inventions of men, who knows that his is the religion of the great bulk of mankind, whilst that of his enemies and persecutors is professed but by a few individuals of a small island-ean it be expected that he should submit in silence to their abuse, and, if he can do no more, not at least, (like the lion in the fable, whose indignation was roused by the kicks which the ass gave him with impunity,) shew himself indignant at the insolence of his insignificant oppressors?

Religious discussion, it cannot be questioned, had much better be conducted with temper and forbearance

than with harshness and severity. But, when those, who provoked the contest in this kingdom, were the first to set example to the contrary, they cannot with justice complain if for insult they receive insult, and if, in return for calumny and misrepresentation, since the catholic scorns these,—he indulge at least a little in sarcasm and ridicule.

^{14,} DEANSGATE Manchester.

AN INTERESTING CONTROVERSY, &c.

PART I.

CHAPTER I.

Sir,

Your's dated May 2d. 1698, came to me on July 21st. It eonsists of two epistles. In the first, you very eivilly take leave, at the foot of eleven pages, making your exit in a notable extemporary prayer, which you kindly conclude thus; "Sir, your real friend to serve you for your soul's health", to which you add an "&c.," and then your name. I could not divine what mysterious matter that "Sc." could have wrapped up in it; but I concluded, that it must contain something sovereignly good, because it seemed to add to the soul's health. However, finding you pretending yourself a soul-physician, in the first epistle, I assured myself of meeting with abundance of spiritual receipts and sovereign soulmedicines in the second. But, opening it, I stood amazed to see it stuffed brim-full of baneful compositions, all fitted for death and damnation, not only of particular souls, but of the universal church; and the professed soul-doctor himself offering them for every one to swallow, with a declared design of first wounding, bruising, ulcerating, corrupting, and totally destroying the whole church, on purpose that he might thereby raise it again to life and a sounder state of health than ever it had enjoyed for one thousand two hundred years before. In this, Sir, you act like that Spanish chymist who cut his master in pieces and put him into his sublimatory glass,

with a design of raising him again by chymical operation to a more durable and better state of life than he had before when he was of God's

making.

In these two epistles I expected you would have supplied the defect of vour first letter dated March 4th. 1697; in which you should have proved what you asserted in our conference in Hexhamshire, viz. that "the church of England is the catholic church". But they are so far from affording us what was wanting in that, that on the contrary, in the latter of them, (which, for the sake of distinction, I shall hereafter call your book) you tell us, page 5th. that "to bid you prove yourselves the eatholic church, is so wild and extravagant a fancy, that you shall not trouble yourself to give it an answer". Yet, for all this, you put us in hopes of great matters. In the former of these epistles (I mean in that dated May 2nd, 1698; for this which I call your book, has neither name nor date) you shew, first, the necessity of finding out the catholic church; then you propose divers ways and means of ascertaining whether the catholic church of Rome, or the church of England, is it; which shews that you allow the claim to one of the two. promise to make it appear, "that the church of Rome is not the catholic church"; and in the next paragraph you oblige yourself, on the other hand, to make it appear, "that the faith and religion of the church of England is that truly ancient eatholic and apostolic faith, which was but once delivered to the saints; and that you hold communion with the true church of God in all "If all this appear, then it will follow", you say, "that the church of England is the true church of God, which is to say that the church of England is the catholic church."

Before you propose the means of effecting all this, you wisely declare the necessity of doing it in these words. "As to find out the truth is a noble design, so it is no less needful in the present case to find out the eatholic church. This is a matter of great importance: for, according to your own principle, till we find it, we can neither tell what is holy scripture, nor understand it; and then God knows in what a sad case we are!"

This is, indeed, an undeniable truth, and you do well in making it the frontispiece of your letter. It is also your church of England's doc-trine, as well as your's and mine, and by the hand of Mr. Rogers, upon the twentieth of her 39 Articles, she delivers it thus: "The church hath authority to judge and determine in controversies of faith. All of us (protestants) do grant that the church as a faithful witness may, yea of necessity must, testify to the world what hath been the doctrine of God's people from time to time; and as a trusty recorder is to keep and make known what the word of God is which it hath received. The church hath power to interpret and expound the word of God. To interpret the word of God is a peculiar blessing given by God only to the church." These are your own church of England's propositions, and are all true.

This principle, thus owned by yourself and established by your church of England, and asserted by the church of Rome, must remain always firm, viz. that till we find the catholic church, we can neither tell what is holy scripture, nor understand it. We come now to the

means you propose to find it.

The first means.

"In old times," you say, "the holy scriptures were accounted the only means of finding out the true church of God."

I cannot believe that ever man so much forgot

himself as you have done here. First to declare, that "till we find out the catholic church, we can neither tell what is holy scripture, nor understand it": and then, in the very next words, to make the scripture the means, yea the only means, of finding out the catholic church. The truth of the first renders the second impossible. Besides, what you say of ancient times is fable: for, in ancient times, between the days of Adam and Moses, for above two thousand years, we do not find that there was any scripture written; and vet there existed, during all that time, a true church, and the world knew how and where to find it. In the beginning of christianity, the New Testament was not written till several years after the christian church was established; yet, all this time, infinite numbers found the church of Christ and entered into its communion. Can you imagine that all those heathens that flocked into it found it out only by the written word? Certainly not! The world might have studied the bible till doomsday before they had all jumped into one and the same faith and catholic church, if they had not received the verbal instructions of the catholic church itself. St. Paul did not appoint the written word for their rule when he tells them, Faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the word of God; that is by the word preached and taught by those preachers whose sound went into all the earth, and their words unto the end of the world : Rom. 10. Our blessed Saviour did not command his apostles to write all that was necessary to be believed, and to send bibles throughout the world, but he bad them Go (themselves) and teach all nations; St. Matt. 28. He commanded them to go into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. St. Mark, 16. So that, in those ancient times of christianity, we do not see that the scripture was either designed, appointed, or

made use of for the means, much less for the only means, of finding out the true church of Christ. But St. Augustine, you say, "proposed this way, and would not allow of any other". Indeed that was a hard ease: would St. Augustine admit of no other? For what end did he (and others) write so many great volumes, teaching, preaching, and working so many miracles, if he would not allow them to be means of bringing infidels and hereties to the knowledge of the church of God? Surely, if by any of these means they might come to understand which it was, he would never tell them that such means were not allowable, nor to be admitted, but that they must fall to their bibles, and there convince themselves of every point of faith and of its being the true church of God, before they could be admitted into it. If you had acted ingenuously you would have told us where this passage is to be found in St. Augustine; but we may guess the reason why you did not eite the place.

I know that in the holy scriptures are denoted the marks and characters of God's church, as unity, sanctity, universality, apostolical succession, perpetual visibility, divine miracles, &c. The scriptures may be said to be the means, so far as, by those notes and characters, it points out to us the church of God. But, in your sense of a means, that is, by taking the scripture for your adequate rule of faith, measure, standard, and platform, (as you call it page 131.) whereby to square out, form, reform, model and make up the faith of the church, that is, such a faith as you imagine and pretend to be right, as by you framed out of scripture; and then, by this your scripture-learned faith, to find out a church that agrees with it (which can be no other, but only the congregation which makes it, or such a charch as vou yourselves make to agree with it): I say; to be a means in this sense, none but

heretics will ever own or pretend it. This is not the finding out of the church which Christ and his apostles instituted and established; but is the making a pretended church of your own "conformable (as you say page 131) to your rule and standard", as you form and fashion that rule and standard by your own sense of it. St. Augustine never taught you either to make up, or seek out a church in this manner, or by this "The universal consent and agreement of people and nations, miracles, antiquity, apostolical succession, the name catholic, &c. were St. Augustine's notes and means of knowing the church; and not a seeking first for articles of faith out of scripture, and then squaring his church to such devised faith. You might have remembered what I wrote to you out of an ancient father in the close of my answer to your letter of March 4th. 1697. That his words may make a stronger impression hereafter I shall once more present you with them, as they are to be found in Eps. contra Epist. Fundam: "There are many things" says he, "that keep me in the bosom of the eatholic church. The consent of people begot by the authority of miracles, nourished by hope, increased by charity, established by antiquity, keeps me in it; the succession of priests from St. Peter detains me in it; and lastly, the name catholic, which, among so many heresies, the church alone has obtained, holds me in it: seeing, that though all heretics would gladly be accounted catholics, yet, if any stranger ask where he may find a catholic church, no heretic dare be so bold as to shew him his own (1).....

(1) In the original M S a leaf is here lost. In the latter part of it, as may be collected from the words of the succeeding page, the author is arguing against protestants from their own practice. He shews them that, contrary to the principle laid down by Mr. Ritschel in his first means of finding out the true church, they themselves, in order to refute the doctrines of the dissenters, are obliged to have recourse to some authority, to interpret the holy scripture. From this he justly concludes that they, to be consistent, must admit the interpretation of the catholic church.

it becomes, a mirror of wonder, shewing every particular sect its own face, beautiful only to

itself, but deformed as hell to all the rest.

To this you have a kind of answer in your book, where you say, "We do not allow every man to follow his own private sense and interpretation of scripture, contrary to the analogy of faith and sense of the primitive church". But this answer coming from your mouths is to them like a worm-eaten nut; for they will tell you, that they do interpret it agreeably and according to the sense of the primitive church and the analogy of faith: and that it is you who do the contrary. What answer will you give to this? They will further demand, by what authority you pretend to disallow their sense and interpretation of it: and what will you say to this ?-Truly, Sir, you must stand mute: for they will certainly pretend with as much reason and as good authority, to interpret scripture in their own sense against you, as you could ever pretend to, in your sense, against the church of Rome or against them; and this, as sure as you live, will put you to silence.

As I told you in my answer to your letter of March the 4th, so I tell you again, viz. that sad experience teaches, that the holy scripture, without the catholic interpretation of it, (which cannot be had till the eatholic church is first found) is so far from reducing the erring part of mankind into one faith and one church, that, on the contrary, every man being his own expositor, it becomes the very ground-work and seed of all their discord and division, producing almost as

many different sects as men.

Recant, then, this your false assertion, that the scripture is the only means or rule of faith; and fall back to your first true principle, "That till we find the catholic church, we can neither tell what is holy Scripture, nor understand it, or else, (as you say) God knows in what a bad case we are."

The second means.

The next means which you propose for finding out the catholic church, is "agreement in doctrine with the primitive church" and you take a special way to introduce it, viz. under the authority of Cardinal Bellarmin, as if he had proposed this means alone of itself without any need at all of his other preceding characters; whereas the Cardinal lays down five other notes of the church which are all to go before this; so that when you have found a church marked with the notes, unity, sanctity, universality, &c. then its agreement in doctrine with the primitive church, is a further mark of its being the true church;not but that the first were sufficient, without examining primitive writings, to denote the true church of God. The three hundred and eighteen Fathers in the Nicene Council noted the church of God under these four heads only, one, holy, catholic, and apostolical; the twelve apostles under these two only, holy, and catholic, as marks sufficient to denote her.

That church, therefore, which is holy and catholic, is undoubtedly the true church of God, and consequently has all the other marks, characters, and properties of the church of God, as unity, apostolical succession, perpetual visibility, miracles, agreement in doctrine with all preceding ages, and all the rest of the Cardinal's fifteen notes.

Now of Bellarmin's sixth note you protestants can make no use, as to the proving of your own protestant doctrines, till you have first proved your protestant church stamped with the two last named characters, at least with that of catholic, which must be supposed to include the others of sanctity, unity, &c.; because, till this be done, you can have no just pretence to

interpret the doctrines and writings of the primitive fathers in your own sense; for, by what authority or reasonable pretence can a church which is not catholic, nor so much as part of the catholic church, as we must suppose your's till you have proved that it is, pretend to give us the catholic church's sense and true meaning of either the sacred scriptures or primitive writings, or to require our assent to the interpretation it gives of them, when its sense contradicts that in which we take them?

In page 5, you propose examining all the doctrines contained in the church of Rome, and in the church of England, and comparing them with the doctrine of the primitive church, and let her be the judge between them which is the catholic church. But there you will still want a judge to determine whether of them interprets the primitive fathers in the right sense in which they ought to be taken, and this judge must be the present catholic church, as your own doctrine cited above out of Rogers grants and teaches. The catholic church, therefore, of the present age must be first found, so that you are still but where you were.

In the same page, you make a very brisk and formal challenge, telling us, that you have at present a great many learned divines of the church of England who are ready to enter upon this service, viz. of comparing doctrines with the primitive church, to see whether that of Rome or England is the catholic church, if our church of Rome will appoint a certain number of men of learning and note to contest it with them.

Thus you challenge.

And to what end, Sir, are so many learned divines and men of note called into the field? I thought that you and I had entered the lists already. Have you then a mind to turn back and

decline the combat? Yes indeed, that you have: for page 5, but a few lines before, you begin to faint and so far to lose courage that you tell me very plainly "That for your part you shall not enter into so large a field and undertake so tedious a work." Thus you slip your own neck out of the noose, and resolve to sleep in a whole skin till the meeting of those imaginary armies of learned divines and men of note. which, I dare say, will scarce happen before the Greek calends. I cannot believe, Sir, that you have so many learned divines at your beck ready for service as you pretend. Perhaps if it came to the push Dr. Jones and Dr. Bawick your own chaplains, will be all that you can bring into the field: two heroes who, to my knowledge, are better acquainted with Guy o' Warwick and Mother Skipton's prophecies than with the fathers of the primitive church. I have a reason for my conjecture, that your army of learned divines is yet to raise, and my reason is this.

In our conference in Hexhamshire at John Wade's, you urged me to prove such points as are in debate between us, to have been doctrines held in the primitive church of the first four centuries, on condition that, if I would undertake this, you would also engage on your side to prove your church of England the catholic church.

This I undertook, and accordingly sent you a letter at Easter 1688, in which is sufficiently proved the point I designed to handle, viz. that of the pope's supremacy and spiritual jurisdiction over the whole church on earth; and that from undeniable testimonies out of the fathers of the four first ages, as also from the four first general councils. The expectation of your answer to this made me defer sending you the like testimonies for other points, as for the real

presence, purgatory, invocation of saints, &c.: being unwilling (as I signified in that letter) to burthen you with too much at a time. Now that letter, though but concerning one point, has been in your hands above these two years, and not one word of answer has been returned to it. This biennial silence gives me reason to believe that you have not yet listed your many divines into service; but, if I mistake, then set them to work; and see if they are able to give me out of those four first centuries, as strong and as convincing testimonies against the pope's being head of the church, as I have sent you for it: if not, then freely acknowledge the truth as to this point, and I shall proceed to prove the rest.

But let me remind you and your divines of one thing, which is, that you deliver the words of the fathers candidly and sincerely, without corrupting them, or mutilating their sentences by taking what may seem for your use and leaving out the rest, not making them contradict themselves, but what you bring out of them against the supremacy you must reconcile with what I have brought for it: and this I request with regard to your other answers. And, lastly, I charge both you and those whom you employ, to bring sufficient evidence that you take the primitive writings in the very same true and undoubted sense, in which the holy Fathers meant, and designed them to be taken when they wrote them. But this you can never do, till you first prove your church of England to be the catholic church. For it is the catholic church alone, and no other pretender, that can ascertain to us the undoubted sense of the scripture and of the Fathers. And this is evident from the grant of your own church, "That the church as a faithful witness may, yea of necessity must testify, to the world, what hath been the doctrine of God's

people from time to time; and as a trusty recorder is to keep and make known, what the word of God is, which it hath received." Rogers.

In page 4th. you argue thus, "The only way, next to the holy scriptures, to find out the true church of God is by the true faith, for the christian faith is before the christian church. And that must be first known and supposed before we can know any such thing as a church. For it is the faith that makes the church, and not the church the faith: and the true church is known by the true doctrine which it teacheth, and not the true doctrine by the church."

The substance of all this is, that the faith and doctrine of the catholic church, must be first known, before we can know the catholic church; and the reasons you give for it are that the faith is before the church and makes

the church.

It is very likely that you have not considered the difference between faith and the objects of faith, when you framed this argument, and to have mistaken one for the other. If by faith's being before the church, you mean the objects of faith, viz. those divine truths which Christ revealed to the first believers, I grant it; but if you mean of formal faith, as it is in man, a belief of those divine objects, I deny it to have been before the church: because this faith or belief could have no being amongst men before they believed, but as soon as they believed they bccame faithful men, that is, they bccame the church. The church (according to your 19th. article) is a congregation of faithful men: consequently the first christian faith and the first christian church began to be, or had its beginning at the same time, and not the one before the other; and being inseparable must be found together: and the church being visible and faith

invisible, this is to be found out and known by that. Your assertion then, that the christian faith is before the christian church is false. Let us consider the next; viz. "It is faith that makes the church." You should have said, it is God that makes the church; for so the prophet Daniel understood it when he said, chap. 2. "The God of Heaven shall set up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed." And in St. Matthew, chap. 16: Christ the son of God lets you know that himself is the maker and builder of his church."

Now the way that God made the first christian church, was by revealing the objects of faith to men, and men by believing those divinely revealed truths became the church. And the belief of those truths is faith; and the first belief of them was the first christian faith; and the first believers, the first christian church, or rather the first of the christian church. you consider it thus, as you really ought, you will easily discern that the objects of faith, not formal faith, existed before the church; and that (as has been said) formal faith, faithful men, and the church had their being or beginning together, and not one before the other. Consequently one could not make the other; because, whatever is to make a thing must itself exist before the thing it is to make; otherwise it could not be there to make it.

Now all divine christian truths, or objects of faith, which Christ immediately revealed to his church of the first age, are proposed and taught as truths so revealed; and as such to be believed by people of the second age. Those of the second age, receiving and believing what the church of the first age thus proposed and believed, became by their so believing of the same faith and church with that of the first age. The

objects of faith or divinely revealed truths, which the church of the second age received from that of the first, it delivered and taught to those of the third age; who, believing what was thus delivered, became of the same faith and church with those of the two first ages. What the church of the third age thus received from that of the second, it delivered to those of the fourth; which, receiving and believing what was so delivered, became of the same faith and church with those of the three former ages. church of the fourth age received it delivered to the fifth; what the fifth thus received it delivered to the sixth; this to the seventh, the seventh to the eighth, the eighth to the ninth; and so down to our present age.

Thus all christian truths (the objects of faith) which were first revealed by Christ have been by every foregoing age proposed, taught, and delivered (as such to be believed) to every im-

mediate succeeding age down to this time.

As those of the second age could not have come to the knowledge of what Christ revealed to the first, but by the teaching of the first age, so neither could those of any following age know what was so revealed but by their being taught it by their immediate forefathers the church of the immediate foregoing age, which had received it by tradition through every preceding age, even from the first, which received it from Christ.

All this considered and rightly understood, it cannot be conceived what you mean when you say "It is the faith that makes the church" more than this, that the faith delivered and taught by their immediate forefathers to their immediate spiritual children makes those receiving and believing it the church: or, to speak thus, makes them of the same church with their forefathers and teachers. If this be your mean-

ing it is good, only the expression of faith making the church, is something more odd and less intelligible to the reader, than to say, as the thing really is, that the Son of God by revealing such divine truths as were necessary to be believed made the church, and the church, by teaching and delivering from hand to hand what was at first revealed, still propagates, nourishes, and preserves itself in existence from time to time, through all ages to the end of the world. This is in effect what your church of England teaches in Mr. Rogers, when she says, "The church of necessity must testify to the world what hath been the doctrine of God's people from time to time, and, as a trusty recorder, is to keep and make known what is the doctrine of God which it hath received.

Seeing then that the church, as your article owns, is the faithful witness, true recorder, and keeper of the faith, doetrine, and word of God which it first received, and that it must of necessity teach, deliver, testify, and make known to the world what is the faith which it thus received and preserves; it of necessity follows, that the church must be first known and found out before we can be taught the faith, which it is obliged to teach and make known to us.

Your propositions therefore, that "faith must be first known before we can know any such thing as a church," and "that the way to find out the true church of God is by the true faith; and "that the true church is to be known by the true doctrine which it teaches, and not the true doctrine by the church", are false, absurd, and contradictory not only to reason and common sense, but even to what your own church of England itself teaches. Nay the last of these propositions contradicts even itself and all

the former. Consider this, Sir, yourself, and I

will endeavour to assist you in it.

"The true church is to be known by the true doctrine which it teaches, and not the true doctrine by the church." The first part of this proposition implies and owns, that the true church teaches true doctrine. If it teach it, as you own, it must teach it to learners who knew it not before; for such as know it have no need of being taught, nor can they properly be said to be taught what they knew before. These learners, then, must necessarily know the true church that teaches, before they can know the true doctrine which it teaches them: for who can be taught a thing by a teacher without knowing the teacher who instructs and teaches him? Thus, Sir, you have by this contradicted all your former propositions; and even the latter part of this proposition contradicts itself. For to say, as the latter part does, that, "the true doctrine cannot be known by the church," and to say as the former part does, that, "the true church teaches true doctrine", that is, that it makes known the true doctrine, (for to teach is to make known by the teacher the thing that is taught) is to say, that the true doctrine cannot be known, or taught by the true church; and yet the true church can, and does make known and teach the true doctrine; which is a complete contradic-

I wonder, Sir, where you found those nonsensical sentences, or what foolish sophist put them into your head. But, what encreases my wonder is, that the learned Vicaress dowager, that critical and sagacious lady your mother, should never discover the absurdity, when she revised and examined your writings, as she assured me she did, and affirmed she thought them very clear, substantial and to the purpose!

Be this as it may, you draw this conclusion from them, that "if the church of Rome have not the true faith it cannot be the true church of God." To which I reply, that, if the church of Rome be the true church of God, she must necessarily have the true faith. And that she is the true church of God you protestants must be forced to grant, otherwise you must deny that any true church existed upon the earth when Luther and you began your pretended reformation. For you neither did then, nor ever since, nor dare at present pitch upon any other church or pretended church under heaven, for the true church in existence when you left the communion of the church of Rome.-Nay, even you, Mr. Ritschel, when, in page 139 of your book, you pretend to tell us where the true church of God was at the time when you left the church of Rome, do not, nor cannot name so much as one church in the world for the true church of God, not even the Greek church itself, which is the only one you there mention; but, on the contrary, you are forced to acknowledge, though against your will, that they were all so infected with errors and corruptions, as to stand in need of a reformation. So that I say you protestants must necessarily confess the church of Rome to have been the true church of God at that time: or else, you must allow, that God had no true church in existence in the whole world.

Moreover, that she is the true church of God is sufficiently proved in the Tree of Life, which I sent you, as also in your protestant chronological tables printed at Cambridge in the year 1685. In short, it is evidently demonstrated from your own words, Mr. Ritschel, as you will find hereafter. Therefore the church of Rome must of necessity have the true faith. On the other hand, if the church of England is not the

the true church of God, she cannot have the true faith. This is evident in itself. But, that the church of England is not the true church of God, is undeniably proved hereafter, and is also evident from her separating herself from, and forsaking the communion of that church which, as I have proved, is the true church of God, viz. the church of Rome. Therefore the church of

England cannot have the true faith.

But, to return to your means of trying doctrines, you bring it at last to "a necessity of examining all the doctrines of all the churches that are now in the world, and comparing them with the doctrines of the primitive church before the catholic church can be found." This is in plain terms to impose an impossibility on the greatest part of the world; for you can never imagine that there can be so much as one man in ten hundred thousand, rightly qualified as to learning, books, time, capacity, and all other necessary eircumstances for the undertaking of this work.—No, no, Sir, you must resolve upon some easier way for the finding out the catholic church, or else you must remain without it for eternity.

Turn back to Cardinal Bellarmin's first note and go gradually on. Find a church that is one, holy, catholic, and apostolical, which you may do by applying his notes of unity, sanctity, universality, and apostolical succession. But you must not apply them to all pretended churches, and congregations in the world, for this is needless; but to the church of Rome only; for no other in the world either can or does pretend to them. By these means you may easily find the church of Rome to be the true church of God. You need not be at much pains; only look in the Tree of Life and you have all this done to your hand. There you will find all

the said notes exactly agreeing with that great body and universal society of christians who hold communion with the present bishop of

Rome, pope Innocent the twelfth.

Nay, the very name catholic is a note, way, and means sufficient of itself to find out the true church of God. This name is proper only to that society of christians now so named. No other sect in the whole world has this title, or dare so much as once lay claim to it. By this name it is easy even for the most ignorant and unlearned to find out the church of God. It daily sounds in every one's ear; and, as an unerring index, points out God's holy church to all both learned and unlearned throughout the world. That church, to which this title and great name catholic properly belongs, cannot possibly want either unity, sanctity, apostolical succession, divine miracles, true doctrine or any other mark proper to the true church of God.

You tell me in your book, page 109, that "my pretence to the name catholic, when I say we can derive it from the apostles themselves &c. is a vain-glorious assertion without the least offer of proof." Yet you put down my very words there in which I cite no less evidence than the apostles' creed itself, in which God's holy church had the name catholic given to it by the twelve apostles themselves. But, it seems, the creed is of no authority with you: I thought it might have stood for a proof sufficient, at least to you who in your first letter pretended to believe it; But, I see, when it clashes with your sentiments

Do you think it possible, Sir, for you ever to lose the name of George Ritschel among your parishioners? Much more impossible it is for the church of God ever to loose the name catholic. If your name, which reaches not much far-

it must be neglected for a lame evidence.

ther than the bounds of your parish, can never be lost or taken from you as long as you live, much more unlikely is it that the church of God, which is spread over the whole earth, should ever be bereaved of its name catholic; especially since it is confirmed to it by the holy Ghost himself, who gave it by the mouths of the twelve apostles as a title whereby the whole world was ever to know

it, as is evident in our creed.

But you argue farther thus. "We know very well that the worst of men, in all ages, have called themselves and have procured others to call them by good names. And, on the other hand, the best of men and things have had very bad nicknames given them. Yet they were never accounted as matter of proof, either to condemn one or justify the other. We know what names were given to our blessed Saviour by the enemies of truth: how the Arians called themselves catholics and the orthodox Athanasians, yet that could not secure them from being condemned for heretics."

And what of all this? Did their miscalling our blessed Saviour either fix their blasphemous names upon him, or deprive him of his own name? Certainly not. Did the Arians by their improper and nick-names deprive the orthodox of their name eatholic, or ever get this title to themselves? No indeed; as all the devices of men and devils, yea, of the great Anti-christ himself, when he comes, can never deprive our blessed Saviour of his most glorious and divine name Jesus Christ the Son of God: so neither is it possible for any or all the hereties that ever were, are, or ever will be, to deprive Christ's church of the name of catholic, or to get this most excellent title to themselves. And you own as much as all this, Sir, when you speak of the Arians arrogating to themselves the name catholic, and giving nicknames to the church and at the same time that

"all this could not secure them from being condemned for hereties," which sentence also strikes home to yourselves as strongly as it does to the Arians; for, notwithstanding your miscalling the catholic church by worse names than ever the Arians did, as anti-christ, w—— of Babylon &e: (such appellations you yourself would gladly give her in several places of your letter, if you durst but speak out) yet all this could never secure your first beginners, Luther, Cranmer, &c, and you their followers from being condemned for hereties, as the Arians were, yea and by the very same authority too.

Pray solve me this question, Sir: If you protestants be God's church and people, how came you to loose the name catholic? Why is not your church at this day called the catholic church, and its professors catholics? On the other hand, if the church of Rome is not the catholic church, but the church of Anti-christ, how came she to get the name catholic? Why do you protestants, her enemies, call her the catholic church, both in your writings and common discourse? Is it not a madness in you to call us by the most honourable name catholics, and yourselves by that infamous term of novelty protestants?

You are very angry with me for telling you that the apostles gave us the name *catholic* when they delivered us the twelve articles of our creed, calling us there by the name of the holy catholic

church.

The name catholic was then given by them to God's holy church, as a certain secure note, by which it was to be known through all ages to those who dissented from it; as is undeniably evident from their obliging every one, without any limitation of time, to the belief of Christ's church under the name catholic church. If the apostles

knew or foresaw that a time would come, in which this name would no longer denote Christ's holy church, but that it would either devolve upon, be usurped or assumed by the w-of Babylon: or that Christ's church would be changed into the synagogue of Anti-christ, they would certainly have limited and appointed how long the world was to believe God's church under this name; and then would have told us by what other names, after the time had elapsed, we were to know and believe it. As for example, they would have ordered us to believe it under the name of the holy catholic church till the times of Martin Luther, Calvin, and Cranmer: and then to believe her no more under that name, but by the name of the holy protestant church. This you must not deny unless you will say the apostles left a creed which in future times should oblige the world to believe, not the church of Christ, but that of Anti-christ, which is blasphemy, not only against the twelve apostles, but the Holy Ghost himself, who then spoke by their mouths. But they limited it to no such time, but, delivering the articles of faith expressly, they were as binding to all future ages as to their own present times. It cannot therefore without blasphemy be supposed that the name catholic should ever cease to denote and signify the church of Christ, or that the name should ever be separated from the thing at first signified by it.

Seeing then that the church of Christ and the name catholic are inseparable, it follows that, where the name is, there is the church; that is, that church which at this day has the name catholic is the true church of God and all the world are obliged by the apostles creed to believe her to be so, and to believe what she teaches. Now that great and ample society of christians in communion with the church and bishop of Rome, St. Peter's successor, in whatever part of the world

they are dispersed, or of whatever people or nation they be, have the name catholic, which no other congregation out of this communion has. Therefore the church of Rome, that universal society, is the true church of God, and consequently all are obliged to believe her by that article of our creed which commands us to believe the holy catholic church.

The great St. Augustine, one of the four most eminent doctors of this church, assures us (ep. contr. Fundam.) that "the name catholic kept him in the bosom of the church;" and again (lib. de vera relig:) he tells us, "we must hold the communion of that church which is named the catholic not only by those of her own faith but also by her enemies; "for," says he, "the heretics and schismatics themselves, when they speak not with their own followers, but with strangers, are forced, whether they will or no, to call the eatholic church nothing else but the catholic church: for they could not be understood unless they discerned it by this name, by which she is called throughout the whole world." Thus, Sir, I have shewn you an easy and infallible means of finding out the true church of God. By this means the most ignorant and simple can as readily and with as little difficulty come to the knowledge of it as the most learned and wise. All that they have to do is to enquire what church it is that has the name catholic.

There is one thing to be demanded concerning your way of examining and trying doctrines by primitive writings. One sort of protestants, as the Lutherans, hold the real presence of Christ's body and blood in the sacrament together with the substance of bread and wine: those of the church of England hold that Christ's body and blood are not really present, but the bread and wine alone: catholics agree with neither, but believe that the substance of bread is, by the powerful words of con-

secration, changed into the very body and blood of Christ.

We will then suppose, according to your way, that all those three differing parties bring testimonies out of the primitive fathers, each one for his own; tenet. We must again suppose that but one of the three takes the primitive writings in the true and right sense: for we must not think that the holy fathers either held all the three different doctrines or contradicted themselves. Now, I here demand, how you know (unless by the judgement and determination of the catholic church of this present time) which of those three parties interprets the writings of the fathers right, and takes them in their true sense? Answer me this, Sir. As I have instanced in this one point of the real presence, so I demand of all other differences in points of faith between the church of England and all other sorts of protestants: and also between you and catholics.

The judge in this case, as I said above, must be the present catholic church: and your own doctrine teaches the same when it says "The church has authority to judge and determine in controversies of faith." It follows therefore that the catholic church must be first known before this way of comparing doctrines can ever satisfy such protestants as adhere to their own private judgments. Besides, we may safely rely upon the judgment and determination of the present catholic church: for, if she cannot be safely relied upon, who can?

The catholic church of this present age being then the most certain and secure interpreter of the scriptures and primitive writings, and she alone having authority and right to expound the same, it follows that she alone can bring the writings of all preceding ages up to the first writings of the apostles themselves inher own defence, and according to her faith and doctrine against all such as oppose her. Yet not that heretics can either oblige or justly require from herthis condescension of proving her doctrine by primitive writings, because she is "the ground and pillar of truth," and a "true recorder and faithful witness of what is the word of God which she has received." This is enough and all that in reason they can require, that she declares unto them her present faith, and that it is the same she received from her immediate forefathers.

Notwithstanding this, as the church is desirous not to refuse or omit any thing that may help or further their reconciliation, she is ready and willing at any time to compare her present doctrines with those of the primitive church, and with the sacred scriptures. Yet she never allows heretics to follow their own private sense or interpretation either of scripture or primitive writings; this being a privilege belonging only to the church, as you protestants also own when you say, "the church hath authority to judge and determine in controversies of faith," and "to interpret the word of God is a peculiar blessing given by God only to the church." Rogers.

To conclude, this your way of comparing and trying doctrines with either scripture or primitive writings could not possibly be a means for Luther, Cranmer, Calvin, Parker, Jewel, &c. to find out the catholic church, while they adhered to their own private sense of them, contrary to the sense of the then existing church. And, as it could not be a means for them, so neither can it be for their followers, for the very same reason.

CHAPTER II.

WHETHER THE PROTESTANT CHURCH OF ENGLAND IS THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

THE next point to be considered is, whether the protestant church of England is, the catholic church. Now, Sir, after we have examined your means, let us see whether, by all the ways and means you have, you be able to perform your promise of proving your church of England to be the catholic church.

I perceived in your letter of March 4th. that you began to grow weary of the undertaking: for, in the very first paragraph, you artfully changed the state of the question from that of the church of England being the catholic church, to this, that "protestants are true catholics." This last question you endeavour, by a great deal of legerdemain, to palm upon me through all that first letter: thinking, if I should forget your first promise, you might decoy me unawares from the first question to the other, and all would be well.

In my answer to that letter I resolved not to take much notice of the shuffle; because, the promise being but verbal, I perceived that, if I pressed you to it, you would deny it. But, since I see in your second epistle (May 2d) that you are again returned to the first state of the question with so much resolution as not only to engage under your hand writing to prove it, but also to propose ways how to do it, you must expect I shall keep you to it till you either effect it, or give it quite up as impossible.

I no sooner east my eyes upon your great book than I met with this sentence in the second paragraph, "I eannot but take notice of the preposterous method you propose to me to prove ourselves the catholic church, before you can believe
that we hold the catholic faith whole and undefiled." This sentence of yours I had observed
before in yours of May 2d. p. 4. But, perceiving
that it stood for no other purpose but as a step
back or necessary recoil, by which you might rebound again with greater violence, as you seem to
do in page 5, of the same letter, I supposed it
might be here again for the same purpose; but,
seeing that you introduce it twice, it is very proper that I should take a little notice of it, at least
with regard to the method itself.

Now, if this be so false, weak and preposterous a method, as you say, why have you so solemnly both in word and writing engaged in it? Is it more preposterous in me to bid you prove your church to be the catholic church, than it is in you to assert that it is so, to promise to make it appear so, and to propose ways and means of doing it? Pray, Sir, would you have me, and your honest parishioners in Hexhamshire so easy, as to believe, that you hold the catholic faith entire and inviolate, before you prove to us that your church is the catholic church? What reason can you give for this? For my part, I can never believe that any church holds entirely the catholic faith, which cannot demonstrate herself to be catholic; and as for them, I must tell you that I take them to be of a sounder judgment than to agree with you in this point.

I am sure we are by the apostles creed, obliged to believe the holy catholic church: it is the church that our blessed saviour commands us to hear: it is the church that St. Paul calls the ground of truth: yet you, Sir, would have us believe what you propose to us for eatholic faith before ever you demonstrate your congregation to be the catholic church: I can neither find scripture nor reason to induce us to do this. I must therefore turn your

words upon yourself and affirm it to be a most preposterous method to bid us believe that your church holds the catholic faith whole and undefiled, before you first testify her to be the catholic church. An Arian, Socinian or Quaker may propose this with as much reason as you can; and what answer would you give them if they said so to you?

I suppose your design in inventing this preposterous topic, and in repeating it a second time, has been rather for a slight shuffle, to further and soften by degrees the main design of freeing yourself from the grand undertaking, rather than for any reason you could see in it; for in page 4 you quite leave it in these words. "Pray what do you mean by the catholic church? If you mean no more than a part or true member of it, I say that the church of England is a sound and true member of

Christ's holy catholic church."

Alas, poor parson! was your church the catholic church when you were at John Wade's in Hexhamshire? was it the catholic church, and the true church of God so often in your letter of May the 2nd? and is it now come to be only a bare member of it? Pray tell me, Dear Sir, what is become of all the rest of the body? Oh miserable! that this unhappy member should loose the rest of its body, and now not know in all the wide world where to find it. Are you sure, Sir, that it is only a member of it? perhaps you may be mistaken: look at it once more: put on that pair of ecclesiastical spectacles, which you made use of at John Wade's, and when you wrote your letter of May 2nd: very likely those more magnifying glasses may make it appear, not a member, but the whole body, as it did before. But it is in vain to give council, I see, for now you are utterly swallowed up in despair: all hopes of ever having your petty congregration proved the catholic church, are ingulphed in this desperate sentence, page 4. "When you

bid me prove ourselves the catholic church, if you mean thereby the one holy catholic church exclusive of all others, this is so wild and extravagant a fancy, that, as it needs not, so I shall not trouble myself to give it an answer."

Thus, Mr. Ritschel, you have put an end to the controversy, by granting me at last, though much

against your will, the contested point.

As to the wildness of the fancy, I must ask whether it lies in me or in you? If it be so wild and extravagant in me for bidding you to do it, it is certainly much more wild and extravagant in you to promise it, and to use so many fruitless endeavours for finding out ways to perform it. What occasion was there for your proposing scripture and primitive writings, for the proving it the catholic church, and the true church of God, when at the bottom you knew it to be no such thing? There is no more to be said on this point than to put it on record that, the protestant church of England is not the catholic church: witness the writings of George Ritschel, Vicar of Hexham,

PART it.

- AND

CHAPTER I.

WHETHER THE PROTESTANT CHURCH OF ENGLAND IS A PART OR TRUE MEMBER OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

HAVING rejected that wild fancy of your church's being the catholic church, you fall upon a conceit of her being a part or member of it; a whim no less extravagant than the former. You introduce it by asking, whether, by the catholic church I mean no more than a part or true member of it? A question as ridiculous as to demand of one who tells you the sun shines, whether he means a part of the sun. You have heard me all along speaking of the whole, and have in several places answered me as speaking of the whole, and now you demand whether I speak of a part. Could you find no better way than this absurd query of introducing the following sentence? "I say that the church of England is a sound and true member of it, because we hold communion with the holy catholic church in faith, worship, and government, those three bonds of catholic union; and consequently the members of the church of England are true catholics." Thus you say; and in this argument there are three assertions to be proved:

First, that you hold communion with the ca-

tholic church in faith:

Secondly, that you hold communion with it in worship:

Thirdly, that you hold communion with it in

government.

My business is, at present, to trace you through your whole book in quest of evidence for the first

of these; for if it cannot be proved that you hold communion with the eatholic church in faith, there will be no need of examining your worship

and government.

In page 6. you begin thus, "Now the spiritual union between the members of Christ's mystical body being invisible, you cannot possibly know it but by examining our faith; for, it is an orthodox faith that makes sound members, and true catholics: so that, if it appears that we believe and embrace the apostolic faith, we hold communion with them in doctrine." Do you think that, by examining your protestant faith, I shall find it the same with that of the catholic church? the same with that of the apostles? and the very same it must be, if you hold communion with the catholic church. But is not this a strange way of arguing, to bid me examine your faith? it is your own business to declare your faith, and then demonstrate it to be the same in all points with that of the catholic church; and the catholic church's faith to be the same in all points with yours; and neither more nor less in one than in the other: but it seems the task is too herculean a labour for you to achieve, and so you would be glad to shuffle it off at any rate.

The reason which you give, why I must examine your faith, is, because the spiritual union is invisible: but, is not your faith invisible too? how then shall I see this faith of yours unless you first uncase it? how shall I know likewise whether you believe and embrace the apostolic faith unless you make it appear? All that is said to it here is: "If it appear:" to which I answer; what, if it never appear? then you can never appear members of the catholic church, and this is all that is likely to

appear, for I see no more.

In page 7 you very seriously declare that "there is but one faith or true religion," and that "God

has had a true church in all ages." "This," you assure me, "the church of England denies no more than she denies the existence of one true and

living God."

You have here uttered a wholesome sentence: but, whether your church will thank you for it, let those judge who understand your Homilies. what you say here be true, then it follows, that the church of England certainly denies the existence of one true and living God; for it is evident that she positively denies any true faith or true religion to have existed at all for above eight hundred years together before the pretended reformation, as may be seen in her Homily against the Peril of Idolatry, which homily is authorised and imposed upon her members for a point of faith in the 35th of her 39 articles. Its words are these: preaching of God's word, most sincere in the beginning, by process of time became less and less pure, and afterwards corrupt, and last of all altogether laid down and left off &c: not only the unlearned and simple, but the learned and wise; not the people only, but the bishops; not the sheep, but also the shepherds themselves, being blinded by the bewitching of images, as blind guides of the blind, fell both into the pit of damnable idolatry; in which all the world, as it were drowned, continued unto our age for the space of eight hundred years; unspoken against in a manner, so that laity and clergy, learned and unlearned, of all ages and sexes, and degrees of men and women and children of whole Christendom (an horrible thing to think) have been at once drowned in abominable idolatry, of all other vices most detested by God, and damnable to men, and that for the space of eight hundred years together. And to this end is come that beginning of setting up of images in churches, then judged harmless, in experience proved not only harmful, but exitious and pestilential, and to

the destruction of all good religion universally."

Thus far the Homily.

Consider this well, Sir, and tell me how you could have the confidence to affirm, that your church of England never denied the existence of one faith or true religion and God's having a true church in all ages, any more than she denies the being of one true and living God; when it is by the same church made an article of protestant faith, to believe this said Homily, which in express terms teaches, that the preaching of God's word became corrupt and altogether forgotten, and that all Christendom, yea, all the world, were for above eight hundred years drowned in abominable and damnable idolatry to the destruction of all good re-

ligion universally?

The doctrine of this Homily is asserted in the writings of the most learned protestants of England. Mr. Perkins, in his exposition of the Creed, and in his book printed in 1565, and in his reformed catholic, affirms, that "before the days of Luther for the space of many hundred years an universal apostacy over-spread the face of the earth, and that it continued for nine hundred years together. Bale, in his sixth and seventh centuries, affirms that "from the year 607 purity of heavenly doctrine vanished in the church, and after Gregory the first it perished." Dr. Fulk, in his answer to a counterfeit catholic, tells you, that "the true church decayed immediately after the times of the apostles." Your little numen, John Jewel, in his apology in defence of it, assures you, that "the truth was unknown at that time and unheard of when Martin Luther and Huldrick Zuinglius first came to the knowledge and preaching of the gospel." This Jewel was the chief man in making your homily: see Burnet on 39 Articles. Your great grand sire, John Calvin, in his tract of theology, is of the same opinion with these. And yourself,

Mr. Ritschel, own, in effect, as much as all these writers and the homily do, when you leap over above one thousand years before you begin to seek for your protestant religion, and there to pretend to grope for it, where, as sure as you live, you will never be able to find it. If God has had a true church and true religion in all ages, why could not the sixteenth age have served you with it without running to the fourth age? Is not this as much as to say, that you contradict yourself; and that there never has been either true church or true religion since the fourth age? There is most wholesome protestant doctrine. An universal apostacy for nine hundred years together! heavenly doctrine perished! the true church decayed! the temple of God and light of the gospel obscured by Antichrist! whole Christendom drowned in damnable idolatry and all good religion destroyed universally: and that for eight hundred, nine hundred, yea, for one thousand two hundred and sixty years together!

Pray, Sir, what church was it that your church was a true member of, during all those eight hundred or twelve hundred damnable years? If it was a member of no church, then it was not a part or member of the catholic church. If it was a member of any one church in all Christendom, then it was utterly drowned in abominable and damnable idolatry. And then where was that communion and common salvation with the true church of God in all ages, of which you so often boast? I hope you will not say that you could have salvation while you were drowned in damnable idolary; for this would render not only your pretended reformation, but even christianity itself, unnecessary. I would have you extricate yourself out of this labyrinth.

Besides this dilemma, you are involved in another. You must either recall your assertion that

"God had a true church in all ages, always professing one true faith or true religion," (and this would be a pity, for it is really true) or else, you must deny the thirty-ninth article of your church of England's faith, which obliges you to believe the homily. By denying your assertion, and agreeing with the homily you murder, as much as lies in you, the church of God for eight hundred years together, and contradict Christ himself, who promised that the gates of hell should never prevail against his church. "And then," as you say, "God knows what a sad case you are in." By renouneing your article and your homily, you incur your church's excommunication. Of the two choose the latter: you had better be anothematized by the pretended church of England than by Christ himself and his holy church: by the one your Hexham vicarage is only lost, by the other your soul for all eternity.

But, supposing that your church of England never denied that God had a true church and true religion in all ages, what is this to the purpose? It will not follow from it that she is either a part or true member of it, or that she holds one faith and true religion. Your business is to prove she does; but, instead of this, you trifle on in things foreign to the subject, telling us, "it is true, indeed, that there is one faith or true religion, and God's having a true church in all ages will profit us nothing unless we ourselves be found true members of it." "And this," you say, "I did prove." What occasion was there of your proving this? who ever denied that God's having a true church will profit us nothing unless we be members of it? One would have thought you might have spent your time better in proving you are true members of it, than in pretending to prove what no one denies. But proceed and tell me how you did prove it: for, although it is nothing to the purpose, yet, I

am desirous of knowing how, or in what manner you did it. "This I proved by asserting" (a very pretty new way indeed of proving! How came you to have so much confidence in your naked assertions as to think them able to pass for armed evidence? But what did you assert?) "that we hold communion with the true church of God before the coming of Christ." What relation, I pray, has this assertion-proof to the thing you pretended to prove by it! Is this assertion (provided it were true, as indeed it is not) any thing like a proof, that "God's having a true church will profit you nothing unless you be found members of it?" Put assertion and assertion-proof together, and it is the same as if you had told us that, your having preached a sermon last Sunday could profit the people nothing unless they heard it, and had proved this by asserting that you wear a canonical gown as other parsons do. There is just as little proved by this, as there was by the other: nor is there the least more sense in it. But, what reason do you give for proving it in this manner? "I did it to shew, you say," what just grounds we protestants have to plead antiquity, and to prevent your repeated charge of novelty." This completes the comedy. You have shewn your church's antiquity, as the man did his gentility who asserted, that "on his shoul he could deduce his pedegree from before Adam."

Let us now have the second assertion proved. "This I proved from hence, that they and we have the same common salvation." Prove this, Sir. "For they were saved by the merits of Jesus Christ alone, as we." We! who? We protestants? you must not expect, Mr. Ritschel, to have it granted that you protestants are saved by the merits and blood of Christ. This is what you have yet to prove. To say that you have the same common salvation with the church of God;

or that you are saved by the blood of Christ, is vain, if you are not members of the church of Christ; which none ought to believe you to be till you prove it. For the merits of Christ, the head, cannot be applied but to those alone who are members of his mystical body the catholic church.—They who are not members of this body (as heretics) are destitute both of the grace and means of having them applied to their souls.

Your way of arguing is singular. First, you assert a thing; to prove which you bring another of your own bare assertions; to prove this a third; for this a fourth; and, when all this is done, the last of your assertions, which should support all the former, wants a prop for itself. Thus, after an abundance of pains in building up your bulwark of argument, at last the whole airy castle tumbles down into its first nothing for want of foundation. You then bring a text of scripture from Acts, chap. 4. verse 12, to prove that there is no salvation in any other but Christ; this no one denies. What you ought to have proved is that you protestants are members of the body of Christ's church; and consequently capable of this salvation in him and through his name. Go on. "Now the fathers under the old testament did enjoy the same spiritual benefits that the church of England doth now under the gospel." And this you prove by another text, as if I were going to deny it, taking it in St. Paul's sense. But the thing you should here have proved, I tell you again, is that you are part of the church of Christ: for, till this be done, you can have no pretence at all to the spiritual benefits which either the fathers under the old testament, Christ's church under the gospel, enjoy. on again thus, "They did eat the same spiritual meat, and drink the same spiritual drink, the same not only with themselves, but also with us

christians, though not the same outward signs and symbols. They had also the same means of justification by faith in Christ." This being also in your first letter you now tell me I passed over it without taking notice of it; and indeed so I did, for I saw nothing in it that could benefit your cause, or prejudice mine. However, for your satisfaction I shall take good notice of it now.

That the fathers of the old testament did eat the same spiritual food, and drink the same spiritual drink with true christians, that is with the church of Christ, that is with us christians, of the holy catholic church, I grant. But that they did eat the same spiritual meat, and drink the same spiritual drink with false christians, that is, with heretics, that is with you protestants, I deny. Nor can you pretend to eat or drink of that spiritual rock Christ (I tell you again) till you have made it evident that you are members of the church of Christ.

I cannot but smile at your pretty little cunning way of begging the thing you are to prove. "They did eat," you say "the same spiritual food, and drink the same spiritual drink with us christians," &c.: that is to say, with us protestant christians. Indeed, Sir, you might as well have said with us protestant heretics: for (1 repeat it again) till vou have proved yourselves to be members of the church of Christ, we cannot take you for any thing better than heretics. And it is certain, that nothing is more false or absurd, or more contrary to christian doctrine, than to say, the fathers of the old testament did eat the same spiritual meat &c. with heretics, or hereties with them; nay, it is madness to say that heretics eat any spiritual meat, or drink any spiritual drink at all, except that with which they are fed at the devil's table. This is all, Sir, that

your doughty argument has made out, though you conceited it to be so awful a thing that I durst not take notice of it.

I observe that your drift all along is, to try if by any means, you can get yourselves shuffled into the society of catholics, or true christians, by your two little syllables, us, and we, which you craftily thrust now and then into your sentences, expecting to obtrude them without our ever noticing the juggle. But this protestant policy will never stand. It is not your asserting that, "they (of the old testament) did eat and drink with us protestants"; or that "we protestants have the same common salvation with them"; or that "we protestants have the same justification by faith in Christ," or "by the merits of the blood of Christ with them"; or that, "we protestants hold communion with the true church of God in faith" &c. it is not, I say, your asserting all these things, that can prove you to be members of the church of Christ, or possibly get vourselves hemmed into its communion, either before Christ's coming or since.

To the question which I asked in my answer to your first letter, viz. what all this signified to prove you the catholic church, or as true catholics as ever lived upon the face of the earth, you answer thus: "Yes, Sir, I think it is very plain that, if we hold communion in faith with the true church of God in all ages, this being the principal bond of catholic union, we justly deserve the name of catholics." To this I reply, that if you do thus hold communion &c. it is very plain, that you are catholics; but if you do not, then it is very plain to the contrary. But you have never yet proved that you do hold this communion; and if you do not hold it, what then? Then it will be very plain that you do not deserve the name of catholics.

This word if, has broken the neck of most of the choicest sentences in your letters; it has haunted you ever since the beginning, and you cannot yet, it seems, get quit of it. For example. "If the church of Rome have not the true faith" &c. "If it be so" &c. "If it appear." "If it appear as I asserted." "If all this appear." "If it appear that we believe." "If we do not break" &c. "If we hold communion" &c. One would have thought that so many ifs and appears might have raised up some auspicious apparition before this time. Well we are not far from it now, for in the same 10th. page you affirm without either if, or and, that "you have proved that the church of England doth hold communion in faith with the true church of God before the coming of Christ. Now, supposing this to be true, as it is not, it would only bring you under the notion of Jews, and this would be all; for, if you would be accounted christians, you must also hold communion in faith with that true church of God which existed as well after the coming of Christ as before. I wonder, Sir, why you make so many pretences to a communion with the church before the coming of Christ, and so few with the christian church since his coming. The question between us is, not about you being members of the Jewish synagogue, but whether you are a part of the christian church, that is the catholic church. You think it easier, it seems, to thrust yourselves into the Jewish synagogue than into the catholic church,; but, for all that it appears you can get entrance into neither. For, the mischief of it is, that your affirmation, that you have proved yourselves to hold communion with the church before the coming of Christ, is not true. And your misfortune is you can neither tell when, nor where, nor how, nor by what evidence you have ever yet proved any such thing. All that you

PART II. 41 CHAP. I.

have done, except your fore-mentioned assertions is only barely to assert that "your protestant faith is the same (in substance) with that of the ancient fathers before the coming of Christ. And this I utterly deny; and you have it yet to prove. For what you argue from Eusebius and the eminent Cardinal Bellarmin will not stand for evidence in your behalf, as you shall see when it is examined. In your letter of March 4. page 5, you argue

thus, "Now, as your famous Bellarmin tells us. christianity changed not the church's substance, but the condition only which it had in the Jewish synagogue, and, as Eusebius proves that the christian religion was then neither strange nor new, even so the truly reformed protestant religion of the church of England is not a new faith or religion but that truly ancient catholic and apostolic faith which was but once delivered unto the saints. And, in your book, page 16, you repeat the same over again thus: "The truth of what I asserted in my letter doth still remain plain and evident, that, as Eusebius tells us the christian religion was neither strange nor new, so the religion of the church of England is as old as christianity itself, that we hold communion in faith with the true church of God and the ancient fathers before the coming of Christ, and so have just grounds to plead antiquity and to call ourselves, as we really are, as true catholics as ever lived upon the face of the earth." You have grounded your argument upon a false supposition, viz. that the christian religion, of which Eusebins and Bellarmin speak, is your protestant religion; and from this you as falsely infer, that your protestant faith is the same in substance with that of the ancient fathers who lived before our Saviour's coming. But, alas poor men! your protestant religion was not in being till many hundred years after Eusebius's time; it is very unlikely therefore that Eusebius should mean it when he speaks of the christian

religion. And, as for Cardinal Bellarmin, he was so far from supposing protestants to be any part of the church of Christ, that, on the contrary, he writes against them and proves them to be heretics; and their protestancy, heresy. Your thus begging the question only puts off the time to no purpose. Prove therefore that your protestant religion is the same with that christian religion of which Eusebius speaks; and that your church is a member of that church of which Bellarmin speaks; and then you will have no further occasion of arguing that it is the same in substance with theirs who lived before the coming of Christ; because we shall then grant it to be the same with that of the catholic church since his coming; and this will end the dispute.

I have now followed your footsteps through your first section, but, without finding any stronger proof for your church's being a part or member of the catholic church, than you had for its being the whole catholic church itself. You force me to pursue you still, for, sec. 5, page 127, you very kindly "pray me have patience a while, and let you examine the matter over again; for you are still, you say, in good hopes of finding this proof. And you fancy I may have overlooked it as I did those gross corruptions in the church of God before the coming of Christ."

Well, Sir, such a civil and reasonable request must not be denied: I am resolved therefore, with as much patience as a repetition of such arguments will admit, to wait till you have thoroughly examined all your evidences over again, whether relating to your church's being a member of the catholic church, or to the true church of God being ever corrupted with gross corruptions in faith. Open then your packet and begin.

CHAP II.

WHETHER PROTESTANTS OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND ARE AS TRUE CATHOLICS AS EVER LIVED UPON THE FACE OF THE EARTH?

THE argument I used to prove this great point was this; there is but one mystical body of Christ, and that we hold communion with the true church of God in all ages as well before as since the coming of Christ." You have this to prove. "This I proved from hence, that, as there is but one body of Christ, so there is but one faith, or true religion, and that we of the church of England have the same faith and true religion with that of our first parents, and the ancient fathers before and after the flood; even that truly ancient catholic and apostolic faith which was but once delivered unto the saints, which is that grand body." I answer, this assertion proves nothing for you. That there is but one body of Christ, and but one faith, and that this one faith is the bond of catholic union, is thus far very true. But it does no more towards proving you to be catholics than it does to your being Mahometans, For those who are not members of this one mystical body the catholic church (as schismatics and heretics are not) can neither be accounted catholics, nor capable of salvation with it. I have told you till I am weary, that you are not to be taken for members of it till you have proved that you are such. Go on then. "Now that we protestants have this grand bond of catholic union and the same common salvation with the church of God in all ages I proved (vou say) from hence. That, though our religion was of late reformed, yet our glorious reformers did not change or make it anew, but only purged it from

that dross and corruption which it contracted from the church of Rome, whereby it became as pure as it was at first, even like gold purified in the fire; which reformation they sealed with their blood." Thus you say. But this begs what it should prove. In the first place, I could wish to know what you mean by the words "our religion," that is, whether you mean that your protestant religion was lately reformed, or that the one faith or, true religion was lately reformed. If you speak of your protestant religion, I agree with you that it was lately reformed, for it has been reformed, and reformed since its first reformation. It received its first form in the reign of king Edward the sixth, king Henry the eight having by schism prepared the way and administered matter to this its form. It did not continue long under this first shape, before its unstable formers thought proper to reform it; for, in this king Edward's reign, were formed two different forms of common prayer, and a new confession of faith consisting of forty-two articles, and new forms of ordination devised for the making such a sort of pretended priests and bishops as they then had a mind to set up. Queen Mary succeeding, the greatest part and most learned of those new reformers and reformed fled into Germany, where in Frankfort, Embden, Strasburg and Zurich, but especially in Frankfort, they fell into such mortal jars, that to this day they have never been reconciled. Queen Elizabeth coming to the crown, another reformation was made, the common prayer altered, confession of faith changed by putting some articles out, inserting new ones, changing others &c. King James the first, moved by that bustle at Hampton court, made a new explanation of the liturgy, contrary to the sense in which they had taken it before; he again altered the confession of faith, leaving it as it now stands in the thirty nine articles; he rejected king Edward's and queen Elizabeth's translations of scripture and ordered a new one to be made. During the reign of king

Charles the first, the unfortunate archbishop Laud would needs be reforming over again. He devised a new common prayer book much like that made in the reign of king Edward the second. This new liturgy he sent into Scotland, thinking, that if he could get it first settled there, it would more easily be introduced into England. But the Knoxian presbytery and their favourers were so offended with it that they resolved vi et armis to oppose it; and they did so, till, at last, it cost both the busy prelate and the king himself, as well as many thousand others, their lives; and here indeed your glorious reformers did actually seal it with their blood, as you say.

After this the presbytery comes to the government, and makes a thorough reformation, purging it from so much dross and corruption that they left no gold at all behind, or at least so little that when the Independent began to refine he could not preceive it, but rather thought that it had never had so much as one single grain of good metal in it since its first forming. And therefore without further reforming he resolved to hammer out of the rude chaos as many new religions as men; till at last he brought it into the most miserable and Babylonical confusion that the world

When king Charles the second was restored the pretended bishops made another reformation of the liturgy. They devised new forms of ordination and consecration, to make bishops, which it seems they thought Edward the sixth's forms were incapable of doing. Thus, Sir, your protestant religion has, since its first birth, assumed more shapes and different forms than ever Proteus himself was seen under. And very likely it needs reforming yet; otherwise an appointment of several bishops and doctors for the work soon after king William's coming to the crown would not have been necessary: nor need Mr. Hickingill have presented his ceremony-monger to the parlia-

ment in the year 1699. But all these reformations are no sign that the protestants have the grand bond of catholic union, faith; but the contrary, for a faith that always needs mending, and a reformation that is always a chopping and changing, as yours has hitherto been, may very reasonably be supposed to have never yet been true, or, if true, to have been spoiled

by the mending.

If by the word "our religion" you do not mean the reformation of this your protestant religion, then you must be speaking of reforming that one faith or true religion which you own to have been in existence in all ages; and of reforming that church of God with which you held communion in all ages, as you Now, to say that your glorious (as you vainly style those infamous apostates) reformers did reform the true church of God, and its one faith, or true religion, is a complete contradiction. For a faith that is but one and true must needs be entire, and cannot therefore be made either more or less without ceasing to be what it was before the addition or diminution, that is, it is not one and the same as it was before when true, therefore not true. And a church or religion, that is already true, cannot be supposed capable of being reformed or mended, because it already is as it ought to be. This wild notion of reforming a thing which is already true is contradictory to your own definition of reformation, which is this: "reformation is the restoring of a thing that is deformed to its due form and constitution. The object of reformation is a thing deformed; because, when it is as it ought to be, it is right, and needs not mending. And what cannot be deformed is no object of reformation." From this definition of yours I bring this argument; that that religion, which is true, is as it ought to be. This is self evident. But that the religion which Luther, Calvin, Cranmer, &c. pretended to reform was then true, is evident from your own words, as we shall hereafter see. Therefore the re-

ligion, which Luther, Calvin, Cranmer &c. pretended to reform, was then as it ought to be, that is, it was then right and needed not reforming, and so could be no object of reformation (as you truly say in your definition). Again, a church or religion, which is true, is not deformed nor corrupted with errors; for otherwise it could not be true, because errors are contrary and destructive to truth. But the religion and church, which they pretended to reform, was at that time the true religion and true church of God. Therefore the church and religion. which your first pretended refomers undertook to reform, was then neither deformed nor corrupted with errors; and thus no object of reformation. Thus, Sir, instead of supporting your former assertions this your definition, by it you have contradicted them all and ruined your pretended reformation.

I have yet to remind you that, in saying "your reformers did not change or make it anew, but only purge it from that dross and corruption, which it had contracted, you beg three things you have still to prove, for you are an eternal beggar, Mr. Ritschel.

1st. That the one faith or true religion can possibly be true, and erroneous and deformed, at one and the same time. 2ndly. That the one true faith, which the church held at the time of your pretended reformation was then actually corrupt and erroneous. 3rdly. That your pretended reformers did really reform, and not rather deform that one faith or true religion, which you so often own the church to have held and believed at that time, when they undertook their pretended reformation. These three points I say you have still to prove, which will happen when you have learned to reconcile contradictions.

After this your so deligent search for evidence you have a mind to present us with the rule and manner of this pretended reformation. And indeed, Sir, you act very kindly in giving us a little recreation after so tiresome an examination of your invisible evidence

The scene opening, the rule appears under the many hard names of, our idea, or platform, or adequate rule, or grand exemplar, or standard, or measure, or magna charta, or unalterable idea, a company of uncouth and hideous names given by you to the holy scripture. Now, according to this idea or magna charta or what you will, must your church be reformed. "Exactly agreeable whereunto," say you, "is the truly reformed protestant religion of the church of England." This I deny, but you pretend to prove it thus. "For our glorious reformers did not enquire after uncertain traditions, but had recourse to the grand exemplar that christian magna charta and made it alone the rule and measure of their reformation." This is an argument indeed! They did not enquire after uncertain traditions, but made the grand examplar alone the rule of their reformation. Therefore their reformation is exactly agreeable to the grand examplar or christian magna charta. A schoolboy beginning to learn to write his A B C. has recourse to the grand examplar his master's copy, and makes it alone the rule and measure of his writings. Therefore what the schoolboy scribbled is exactly agreeable to his masters copy. Thus like a schoolboy you argue, Mr. Ritschel.

To your reformers not enquiring after uncertain traditions I answer, they did very well. But they would have done still better had they enquired after certain traditions. But they, cautious men, were so afraid of uncertain traditions that they resolved (to make sure work) not to make any enquiry at all, even after such as were really certain. As to their making that magna charta their rule it does not prove that either that rule was proper for squaring out such a model, or that the work was performed exactly, and in all points according to that rule. These two points then you have to prove. For the evidencing this last you will

be obliged, first, to give us an entire catalogue of all fundamental points of faith that are contained in your rule. Secondly, you must likewise produce another catalogue of all and every fundamental point of faith that your pretended reformers thought of necessity fit to own and propose to the protestant church of England to be believed; which two lists must exactly agree in every point, otherwise you will not be able to make it appear that your truly reformed protestant church of England is exactly agreeable to your idea or grand exemplar. Thus far, Sir, I have accompanied you in the examination of evidence, and all I or you can find proved by them is quite contrary to the end for which you produced them, as is shown also above.

Notwithstanding all this you are still resolved to have the true church of God corrupted. And therefore what cannot be done by dint of argument you expect to perform by authority of sacred scripture: for you will needs have the scripture to make and mar God's holy church. I should have said mar and make, for by the scripture you first mar her, by making her corrupt, erroneous and deformed, and this on purpose that by scripture you may again make or reform her.

CHAP. III.

AN EXAMINATION OF SOME TEXTS OF SCRIPTURE ALLEDGED TO PROVE THE CHURCH OF GOD TO HAVE BEEN CORRUPTED IN FAITH BEFORE THE COMING OF CHRIST.

IN my answer to your letter of March 4th I told you, if the church you reformed was at that time the true church of God, then their was no need of reforming it. To which you thus reply. "I deny your consequence, for that the true church of God may at some times have many crrors and corruptions both in faith and manners, which ought to be reformed. Such was the state of the church of God under Ahab king of Israel: there was such a general apostacy, it was so deformed with corruptions." 1 kings. 19 chap. Here you suppose those apostatizing idolaters of the Iraelites to be the church of God while in their idolatry. But this is a false supposition; for, as soon as they became idolaters, they ceased to be the church of God, or so much as members of it. Secondly, you say it is a general or universal apostacy of the whole church of God. But this is so notoriously false that you even contradict it yourself in the very same paragraph, page 134, producing out of the 18th, verse of the same chapter no fewer than seven thousand that had not bowed their knees to Baal. And you might have added to these the whole kingdom of Juda over which the good kings Asa and Josaphat then reigned, which was not involved in that apostacy nor guilty of idolatry to Baal or any other false God. So that it was far from an apostacy of the whole church of God.

"Like unto this," say you, "was the state of the church of God under Manasses king of Juda,

2 kings, chapter 21." If you had minded that chapter well, Mr. Ritschel, you might have seen in the tenth and fourteenth verses that the whole church of God did not then totally fall. For there are the holy prophets, and a remnant of God's inheritance mentioned; nor do you know that the other ten tribes were at that time in idolatry. So that there was not a general apostacy, as you falsely insinuated. After this you bring the first chapter of Isaiah to prove a total corruption in faith from the foot to the head of God's church: whereas, in all that whole chapter, there is not one word of their idolatry, schism, heresy, or corruption in faith. What the prophet so severely reprehends is, their wicked manners and bad lives, not any errors in faith, as you may see by reading the chapter, where their several vices are by name exclaimed against, in so much that they are for them look upon as a harlot. Yet, as to faith, she is still called the faithful city. And it is evident they still kept their faith from their then offering sacrifices and oblations to the true God, a sign evident enough that they were not idolaters. And, though those their sacrifices were not acceptable, yet it was not for their errors or corruptions in faith, but for their blood, murders, rebellions, oppressions, &c. as you yourself also signify, p. 87. But, admit this wickedness of theirs had been against faith, yet by your favour, Sir, you ought not, from that hyperbolical expression of the prophet, to have thus unskilfully, as well as uncharitably, concluded that all were fallen from the faith, and not so much as one left in the true belief. you had not been stupified with the impious desire of having God's holy church utterly lost and inguiphed in apostacy, you would certainly have observed the ninth verse of the same chapter, where there is mention made of a small remnant secured by the Lord of Hosts from the wickedness of the rest; which small number is, in the foregoing verse, called the daughter of Sion, that is, the church; but the wicked are resembled to Sodom and Gomorrah.

This puts me in mind of your corrupt and false gloss put upon the text when you say, "God complains of the daughter of of Sion"; whereas the daughter of Sion is rather compassionated as a cottage left in a vineyard, as a lodge in a garden of cucumbers, and as a besieged city, verse 8, and the complaint is against the wicked, to whom the prophet says, hear the word of the Lord, ye rulers of Sodom; give ear unto the law of our God, ye people of Gomorrah, v. 10. I say therefore if their fall had been in faith (as it then was not) yet you cannot make it a total or universal apostacy while the holy prophet Isaiah himself and that remnant, the daughter of Sion, were safe and untainted with the corruption. Thus, Sir, you deal with the sacred scripture: I wonder your own conscience checks you not when you put such false and forced expositions upon the word of God.

You alledge no more scripture authorities in this section, yet, since you so often make use of it in other places, I shall, for method sake, examine them all under this head, whether they relate to the pretended corruptions of the universal, or to

the erring of a particular church.

You tell me "you perceive I have no mind to acknowledge any corruptions (in faith) in the church of God either before or since the coming of Christ," which is a very true and right perception. And "you suppose my reason is, to take away all pretence of a reformation." But this your supposition, Mr. Ritschel, is as false as the former is true: for, if you had never pretended a reformation, I should have still had the same mind never to acknowledge corruptions in faith in the church of God, because I know her to be the pil-

lar and ground of truth, and secured by the Holy Ghost from all error. "Otherwise," say you, "you might have found corruptions, yea very many corruptions, in the church of God before the coming of Christ, and those both in doctrine and manners. Pray what do you think of the state of the church of God before that good king Josias's reformation? 2 Kings, 23. I suppose you will not call them sehisnatics for it, and say they did break the bond of catholic union.

Besides what I have already replied to this, I must further tell you, that there is a great deal of protestant legerdemain in this question. you demand in the singular number, "what I think of the church of God"? Then, in the plural you suppose I will not call "them" schismatics. This you do to confound the church and the fallen idolaters together: hereby to infer that the whole church of God fell, and that the whole church was again reformed. Or else (for either will be for your turn) that those who fell into idolatry remained still, notwithstanding their idolatry, part and members of the church of God. And it is certain you aim at this from your supposing "I will not call them schismatics." But, to the question, "what do I think of the church of God," I answer, the church of God was then in as good state as ever, as to its faith, keeping it sound, whole, and undefiled, and neither needed reformation in faith, nor did Josias pretend to reform it. But as to your supposing I will not call "them" schismatics, I answer, I call them not only schismatics, but I call them idolatrous apostates, as you yourself do: and say, while they were under this apostacy they were no part of the church of God. For the belief of false Gods and worship of idols are inconsistent with, and destructive to the faith and worship of the true God, consequently break the bonds of catholic union by which they were united to the

church of God. Yet you, charitable man, though you make faith and worship two bonds of catholic union, yet will still have those joined to the church who have broken them both; and therefore cannot endure to have them called schismatics. You are content to run into this absurdity rather than not have the church of God corrupt, and so you want a pretence of reforming her. charity you have for those idolaters, I am sure you shew none to the true church of God. these Israelites, who were thus fallen from the church into idolatry, whom the good king Josias brought back again into the church by reducing them to their former faith and worship of God. But you go on, "did not the Saducees in the time of Christ, deny the resurrection of the dead and the existence of angels and spirits, and did not the Scribes and Pharisees greatly err"? I answer, ves they did. The Saducees were heretics for denying the resurrection and the being of angels and spirits. They Scribes and Pharisces, and all others of the then misbelieving Jews who would not believe our Saviour, then come in the flesh, to be the Messias, became infidels, and ceased to be any longer members of the church of God. church of God was so far from being extinguished or corrupted by their disbelief, that, on the contrary, it was never more beautiful, nor more safe and secure, nor more happy, than at that very time when the son of God its redeemer was then visibly present with it in human flesh, and, though its visible members were not so many at that time as at others, yet, considering the excellence, dignity, and supereminent sanctity of its then public professors, as our blessed Lady the Mother of God, St. Joseph, St. Joachim, St. Anne, St. Zachary, St. Elizabeth, St. John Baptist, the holy shepherds who visited Christ at his birth in Bethlem, the three sages who adored him in the manger, and many

others, as his holy apostles and disciples and others who, when he more puplicly revealed himself by the many great and stupendous miracles which he wrought, believed in him; I say, considering all this, you will find no ground for your blasphemous text that "the church of God was then corrupted" though you diabolically eite scripture (in a false sense) to prove it. You further demand, "doth not God complain of the daughter of Sion, Isaiah 1.?" This I have answered already where I have shewn you how falsely you interpret that text.

Then you conclude your search after scripture authority thus, "but your love (speaking to me) is so great that it hides all her deformities: and you still fancy her to be admirably fair and beautiful without spot or blemish, and do not think there was any need of reformation." It is very true, my love to the catholic church is as great and far greater than you can imagine; and, if it were millions of times greater than it is, yet it would come far short of what she deserves. But it is an absurd thought of yours to imagine my love hides any deformities in her that neither has, nor ever had, nor ever can have at all. As to my thoughts of her being so admirably fair and beautiful they are confirmed by St. Paul himself.

I am sure, Mr. Ritschel, for your part, you discover as little love and affection to this mystical body and most beautiful spouse of Christ, as the reprobated Jews did to Christ himself. The Jews bruised, wounded and mangled his most innocent and sacred body with cruel stripes, and crowned his tender head with sharp and piercing thorns, leaving not any sound part in him from head to foot, and even deprived him of life by nailing his sacred hands and feet to the cross. You, Sir, imitating them, bend all your endeavours to wound, bruise, ulcerate, (to use your own words)

corrupt, deform, mangle, rend in pieces, and utterly destroy, if you could, his mystical body the holy catholic church. You shew far more love and cordial affection to schismatics, heretics, unbelieveing Jews, idolaters, and infamous apostates, than to the church of God, when you plead thus earnestly for their being yet members and parts of her.

You speak much of "faith's being the grand bond of catholic union;" and so the catholic faith is to eatholics: for it unites them all together into the holy catholic church. But, that this faith should join to the charch such as have no faith at all in them, as Saducees, Jews, schismatics, heretics, idolaters, and apostates, is the most amazing paradox that ever had being in the mind of man.

That bond of catholic union then, of which you speak, can never be the catholic faith, for the catholic faith never united any to the church of God but such as believed and held it entire and inviolate, as you may learn by the Athanasian creed. bond you speak of must therefore certainly be your protestant faith (such as it is). Now I will not say but by this protestant bond you may work wonders, and knit (to use our own words) together vast shoals of people, of all seets, so indeed to make up a thing you call a church, of a large extent and great antiquity: and so you do. For you stretch it out to that incredible and boundless circumference as to circle within it idolatry, worshippers of false Gods, (as in page 104, 134) schismatics and heretics, (as in page 3, 105, 136, 139, 140) Saducees, Pharisees, Scribes, who were misbelievers, (as in page 105) and apostates (page 134 &c.) By which reason you also include all of those sorts and sects that have ever been upon the face of the earth from the beginning to this day. Consider it well, Sir. By making the idolaters that fell under Ahab and Manasses part of the church, you take in all other idolaters by the same reason

that have ever been. By bringing in the misbelieving Jews in Christ's time for part, you make way for all the rest of the Jews that have been since to this day, though such grand enemies to Christ and Christianity. By embracing the Saducees, Balaamites, and the Nicholaitan heretics, and by also making members of the Waldensian heretics, and of the schismatical and heretical Greek churches, you open the gates to all the sehismatics and heretics that have ever divided themselves from, or rebelled against the church of God. In short, Mr. Ritschel, you have compassed within this your prodigious bond of protestant union, all Jews, Turks, infidels, sehismatics and heretics that have ever been from the days of your first parent Cain, to your own time. A brave bundle you have bound up and buckled together by this your protestant bond of union! This is your vast large protestant eatholic church, with which vou hold, and have held, communion in all ages. This is that holy congregation, with which you have the same common salvation you talk of. wonder you so often and so loudly proclaim against her as leprous, wounded, bruised, ulcerated, corrupted, and horridly deformed from head to foot (i.e. from Cain to G. R.) as you do in the places before cited. Seeing this is your church, I shall readily own "you have (as you say page 16) just ground to plead antiquity and to call yourselves as true catholies (of the sort) as ever lived upon the face of the earth." You need neither except Cain, Nimrod, Judas Iscariot, Simon Magus, Arius, Berengarius, Luther, or any of them all, for l own you protestants of the church of England are as true to the cause as the best of them. But I pray, Sir, keep this church of yours to yourselves, and yourselves to it, if you please: for, God forbid that any who tender God's honor, or their own eternal good, should ever come within the limits of

your large bond of union; for my part, I am resolved to put it into my Litany: from communion with

your protestant kirk-Good Lord deliver us.

Here are yet two texts of scripture to be examined, which, though they strike not so directly against the *universal church* as the former, were designed to do, (they being partly spoken against particular churches) yet, as to what you pretend to prove by them, they are no less wretchedly handled than the other.

In the first page of your book you tell me "you cannot but take notice of the preposterous method I propose to you, to prove yourselves the catholic church before I can believe you hold the catholic faith whole and undefiled." By this same rule," say you, "the church of Pergamos might have justified herself and pleaded her great patience, constancy and love of Christ, who gives this testimony of her, (Rev.: 2. 13.) Thou holdest fast my name and hast not denied my faith." "But," continue you, "doth this prove her to be pure and undefiled, and acquit her from all suspicion and imputation of false doctrine, of which he doth accuse her in the following verse; but I have a few things against thee because thou hast there them that hold the doctrine of Balaam, &c. Thou hast also there them that hold the doctrines of the Nicolaites, which thing I hate; and for which he doth severely threaten her in the following verse, unless she did repent, that is" say you "reform herself," &c: "hereby", you tell me, "I may see that my way of arguing is very fallacious." You mistake, Sir, for this proves it not so. But it evidences yourself a most fallacious expositor of scripture, as I shall presently shew you. From this text concerning the church of Pergamos you would infer, that the catholic church may be corrupted in faith; which cannot be gathered from the fall of a particular church, much

less from this of Pergamos, which was not then erroneous, as you falsely insinuate both here and in page 136, by bringing in this church of Pergamos as impure and defiled, and confidently affirming that our blessed Saviour accuses her of false doctrine: and yet, in the very foregoing words, you cite the text itself, which proves quite the contrary, viz. "that Christ gives testimony of her, thou holdest fast my name and hast not denied my faith." Those, whom Christ accuses of false doctrine, are only such as held the doctrines of Balaam and the Nicholaites, and not the church itself. What he blames the church for is, those impious heretics there, that is, for not expelling them and casting them out by excommunication. The text is clear, "I have a few things against thee, because thou hast there them that hold the doctrine of Balaam," &c.: so hast thou also there them that hold the doctrine of the Nicolaites which thing I hate. Those who read this chapter of the revelations may see, however weak their judgment may be, that the accusation is only against the heretics, and that all the blame laid to the church is, I say, only for having them there without expelling them; and this is still more evident from the following verse, where Christ says to the church, repent, or else I will come unto thee quickly and will fight against them with the sword of my mouth. Observe here, he bids the church repent, that is, of her having them there: for, of what else should she be bidden to repent, but of that for which she is blamed? He does not bid her repent or reform herself of any false doctrine or errors in faith, as you would insinuate by putting your own false gloss upon the text when you say, "he bidsher reform herself;" nor does he so severely threatenher, as you still further maliciously insiduate, to make it seem as if she was threatened for holding false doctrine and corruptions in faith. But the severity of the threatening is against the hereties; I will fight against them with the sword of my mouth. Now these last words of the text you very craftily, corruptly and disingenuously omit, in order to get the threatening bent only at the church, not at the hereties, or, at least, as much against the church as against them, as if the church had been equally guilty of the heresy with them.

In another place you cite also the church of Ephesus, from the same chapter of Revelations, as if she also had erred in faith. Yet, the text is so far from signifying any such thing, that, on the contrary, it frees her from this imputation, when it says of her; thou triedst them who say they are apostles and are not; and hast thou found them liars. Nor does he accuse her of any errors in faith or doctrine, but, in leaving her first love, that is, in growing cold and slack in charity. I have some things against thee because thou hast lost thy first love.

Thus far, Sir, I have examined your texts of scripture brought, as by you expounded, against the church of God. And there is not one of these chapters, by you cited for the church's being corrupted, but what evidently proves her, at those very times when idolatry and heresy raged the most, still remaining constant, uncorrupted, and firm in in faith. Whether to accuse you of malice or ignorance I know not; but it seems as if both had share in your corrupt expositions. Be it as it will, this is certain, that you have misapplied and falsely interpreted every text you have meddled with.

I remember in your book, page 47, you tell me that "the church of England has the best interpreter and expositor of scripture that is to be found in the whole christian world.": which if true, then it is certain you yourself have never been instructed by that expositor. And, indeed,

if your church of England apply and interpret scripture at this day, as she did not long ago by Mr. Rogers in his book of the 39 articles, and as you, who would seem one of her learned expositors, have done in the above said texts, I dare boldly affirm, that she is the very worst expositor that was ever known in the whole republic of heretics, nay, I question whether she may not take the right hand of him who brought scripture against the

son of God himself.

You tell me "the primitive church and first four general councils is your church of England's expositor of scripture. (page 47.) You might as well have said, and with as much truth too, that the ages yet to come are your expositors. mitive fathers and first four councils would have hissed at such expositors as you and your church of England. I would have you shew me, which of those primitive expositors ever brought the said texts of scripture, as you have done, to prove that the church of God fell into a general apostacy, and was totally corrupted and deformed with errors in faith from head to foot? If you cannot do this, it will be but just to charge you with unpardonable wrong done to the primitive fathers, when you bring scripture in such a sense as none of them ever dreamed of, or would without horror have thought on. Besides, your parishioners have just reason to exclaim against you for a grand impostor, in thus obtruding and imposing upon them those your own false and heretical interpretations under the name and authority of the primitive church and four first councils, when, in very deed, those ancient fathers would, I say again, have abhorred any such anti-christian exposition. Well, I can now justly conclude, that by endeavouring to make God's holy church appear corrupt, you have shewn yourself a corrupt expositor of the word of God.

CHAP. IV.

YOUR RIDICULOUS DISTINCTION, MR. RITSCHEL, BE-TWEEN A TRUE CHURCH AND A SOUND CHURCH CONSIDERED; AS ALSO, YOUR FAMILIAR EXAM-PLES OF AN INFECTED MAN AND DROSSY GOLD. F

YOU introduce your distinction with a text of scripture taken from Isaiah, 1. 6. which, though answered above, yet I must not omit putting it down as by you delivered, page 140. "And doth not God complain of the daughter of Sion in the first chapter of Isaiah, that the whole head was sick and the whole heart faint, from the sole of the foot even to the head there was no soundness in it, but wounds, bruises and putrifying sores. And, therefore, we distinguish between a true church and a sound church. As a man may be infected with the plague or leprosy, and be full of wounds and bruises and putrifying sores, and yet be a true man, because he still retains the essential parts of a man, which are an immortal soul and human body, and these two united together, which is the form and constitutive part of man." I hope you will not say, that the essential part of man, the soul, is infected and unsound by the body's infection. If not, then your example is impertinent and improperly applied against faith, that essential part of the church. For, faith is to the church as the soul of man is to the body, and can no more be destroyed, hurt, or corrupted in the whole church, than the soul of man can be wounded, bruised, putrified, or annihilated by the sickness of the body.

It is ridiculous to see that, after you have brought this familiar example, as you call it, you are put to your wits end what use to make

of it, or how to apply it. For, your fine, nice distinction, which the example is to illustrate, as you say, you begin, at the first, to level against the universal church, thinking thereby to shew that the whole catholic church can be infected and unsound from head to foot, and corrupted in every part with errors in faith, and yet, at the same time still remain the true church of God. But, having fortunately so much brains in your solid head as to discern it is a contradiction, you in the next paragraph wisely change the conceit from the possibility that the universal church can err, to this, that a particular church may be corrupt in faith, and yet remain true in faith. By the same sagacity of judgment, which assisted you in discovering the former, you also perceive this to be as notorious a contradiction as that, and so you notably turn it off to this, that, "some members of a particular church may err and become corrupted in their faith, and yet the particular church still keep its foundation (faith) sure." And this, Sir, is very true; but, you cannot leave a thing when it is well; for, you further argue from the corruption of the said some particular members of the particular church, that the whole particular church itself is sickly and unsound; which is a most notorious piece of nonsense. Reflect seriously upon that paragraph of yours, which immediately follows the example of the unsound and infected man. this. "So we say a particular church may not be free from all corruptions, nor hold the holy eatholic faith, in all points thereof, whole and undefiled. Yet, if the whole foundation thereof remain sure, though a few may build upon that foundation both hay, and straw, and stubble, such a particular church may not be immediately cut off from being any longer a member of Christ's mystical body, though it may be a very sickly and unsound member, as appears from the case of the churches of Ephesus and Pergamos."

Consider, I say, all this, and you will find in it as much as I have yet discovered, and perhaps more. For, besides the change of the state of the question from the catholic to a particular church, from a particular church to some members of it, there is also a false supposition, viz. that the catholic faith, though not kept whole and undefiled, yet the foundation thereof may remain sure, which is a plain contradiction. For, any one error in faith, destroys faith the foundation; because all the articles of faith being received upon one and the same motive, (viz.) the verity of the revealer, the formal denial of any one must necessarily be a virtual denial of all, and consequently the destruction of faith, without which no one can be saved. And this is evident from St. Paul's condemning Hymeneus and Philetus for one only error in faith. Shun, says he, profane and vain speeches: for they grow much towards impicty: and their speech spreadeth like a cancer: of whom are Hymeneus and Philetus, who have erred from the truth, saying that the resurrection is past already, and have subverted the faith of some. 2 Tim. 2.: 16, 17, 18. By this example we see that one error overthrows faith. That member which holds not the catholic faith whole and undefiled shall perish eternally, says St. Athanasius in the creed.

You likewise misapply and falsely interpret St. Paul, when you thus apply to faith what he speaks of works. You would make the holy apostle say, the *foundation*, faith, may remain sure at the very time and in the very persons, that it is mixed with the wood, hay, and stubble of errors and corruptions, which, you may see by the examples of Hymeneus and Philetus, was a thing never likely to enter into the mind of St. Paul. Which of the primitive fathers or councils taught you to expound St. Paul in this manner?

Read my letter in defence of purgatory, and you will there find in what sense the primitive church understood St Paul's words concerning the building wood, hay, stubble, (that is, imperfect works)

upon the foundation, Christ.

To give you a right understanding of the matter, for I see you talk at random, you must know, that, when one particular member errs and becomes corrupted in faith, though but in one single point, his whole faith is thereby destroyed, and he is an unfaithful man, and so hindered from being a member: (you must mind that I speak always of such as pertinaciously and obstinately adhere to their error when the contrary is proposed or is condemned by the church) so, in like manner, as many others as thus err, so many are cut off from the body of that particular church of which they were members; consequently, from the body of the catholic or universal church, of which that particular church is a part. In like manner, if a particular church become thus erroneous and corrupt, it is hereby separated, and by excommunication to be cut off from the catholic church, as its former corrupt members were from it. You must understand further that the erring of one, or some few members of a particular church, does not render the particular church itself (I mean the rest of it that remains free from error) sickly and unsound, as you, forming a blind mistake, thus boldly assert. Nor does the erring of a particular church at all hurt, corrupt, or render unsound the universal church, as your argument would gladly make it seem to do. It were very unreasonable to charge the whole catholic church with corruptions, sickness, and unsoundness in faith because some particular church itself has lost its faith. If some one simple cottage at the skirts of a city were infected with the plague, would you

therefore go and shut up all the rest of the houses in the town and proclaim them all unsound and infected? Or, if some one town or city were totally thus infected, would you therefore conclude the whole world languished under the same mortal disease at the same time? Yet your arguing that a particular church is weak, sick, and unsound, because some members of it are corrupted, is grounded upon no better reason. The Balamites and Nicholaitan heretics only lost their own faith, they hurt not the faith of the church of Pergamos; for, as our Saviour testifies, that church still kept the faith, as is already shewn. So neither did the fall of Hymeneus and Philetus hurt or wound the faith of those who stood untainted with their error: for in such, as St. Paul says, the foundation of God stood firm, having the seal. In short, by erring, I say, in any one point of faith, the whole faith of those who so err is lost and destroyed, and its foundation remains no longer sure, or at all in them. It is those who err not at all, but hold the catholic faith whole and inviolate in all points thereof, that keep the foundation sure and firm.

The promise of our Saviour, that his church should never fail or be prevailed against by the gates of hell, on the one hand, and your pretence to reformation on the other, force you to confound yourself between two contrary principles.

First, you are forced to own (as indeed you do in many places) that God has had a true church in all ages: or else you would split yourself upon the dangerous rock of contradicting our blessed Saviour himself. Secondly, you are, on the other hand, forced to affirm and hold that the church of God was corrupt and deformed with errors in faith, at that time when your impious reformers pretended to reform her, or else she could not be pretended an object of reformation, and this

would break down and demolish the whole fabric of protestancy. Now you, not being able to hammer out of your tenacious brain any shew of argument likely to reconcile this contradiction, resolve upon this odd topic, of distinguishing between a true church and a sound church, the most ridiculous conceited whim that ever entered into a parson's head, and this you illustrate, as you say, by the aforesaid familiar example of a man infected with a plague. But, that your plaguy man should be so luminous as to illustrate the church of God to be unsound, at the same that it is true, is more than ever you can discern or make appear. But the contrary is yet further evident, for the church of God, when you began to reform, was then true; or else it could not be. as you say, true in all ages. If the church was then true, its faith was then true, because faith is essential to the church, as is evident from your 19th. article, and cannot be denied, unless you can tell how to make a church without faith. faith was then true, it must needs be saving faith, that is, such a faith as joined with hope and charity (which is always to be supposed) is sufficient to salvation. For he that says the true faith is not sufficient to salvation, will find no faith at all that will save. The faith of the church being therefore saving faith, it must needs be whole, entire, and undefiled: for otherwise it could not save those that held it, as is evident from the Athanasian creed, which obliges us to believe, that "whosoever will be saved it is necessary that he hold the catholic faith, which faith unless every one do keep whole and undefiled without doubt he shall perish eternally." The faith of the church being then whole, entire and undefiled, it must of necessity be free from errors and corruptions and all deformity; because errors and corruptions in faith break its

integrity and defile faith: for, if they did not, then faith would not be at all damnified, hurt, prejudiced or deformed by them: and consequently could still be no object of reformation; for, as you say "what is not deformed is still as it ought to be, that is, it is right and needs no mending." Seeing then that the church's faith, when you began your pretended reformation, was then free from all deformity, errors, and corruptions, it must of necessity be sound; for what could make it unsound, when there was neither deformity, error, nor corruption in it?

In short, seeing that God has had a true church in all ages, as you have so often granted, it undeniably follows, that he has had a sound church in all ages: consequently, a true and sound church at that time when your inglorious reformers began their pretended reformation. And will you now say they could reform the church that was

already both sound and true?

Where now, Mr. Ritschel, is your pretended object of reformation? What is become of your nice distinction between a true church and a sound church? What has your plaguy, leprous, and infected man illustrated more than that his master's judgment is unsound, and his faith plaguy and infected with errors and corruptions? Well, Sir, to give you all the play you can expect, admitting this your infected man were as pertinent and pat an example to illustrate your distinction as you would pretend; yet neither example nor distinction can stand for proof, argument or evidence that the true church of God was actually erroneous and corrupt in faith at that very time when you began your pretended refor-You therefore do but still point in question. Let us yet suppose another impossibility: admit your aforesaid texts of scripture were as good evidence for an universal

apostacy of the church, before the coming of Christ, as you can wish, yet there is no evidence at all that the catholic church was actually in error and corrupted, or in the least deformed in faith, at that very time when you began your pretended reformation. So that here is nothing

but beggary still.

Your other example of drossy gold purified in the fire, makes no more out for your point than the former. For, though such drossy gold may be purified, and your sick man cured, yet, it is nonsense to say that a sound man can be cured that has nothing to be cured in him; or that the most simple and fine gold, which has neither dross, corruption, nor impurity in it, can be purified. Now the holy catholic church, that unblemished and immaculate spouse of Christ, is justly compared to the purest and finest gold in nature, and therefore cannot be supposed capable of being made more pure than she is. In a word, put all your beggarly assertions, pretended proofs, conceited distinctions, and illustrious examples together, and you cannot possibly raise from them the thinnest shadow of evidence or proof, that the catholic church may or can be corrupted in faith: much less that she was actually erroneous, corrupt, and deformed in faith, when your ignominious reformers began their pretended reformation.

CHAP. V.

MR. ROGERS' PROPOSITION THAT "THE VISIBLE CHURCH MAY AND HAS ERRED IN DOCTRINE" BY YOU OWNED AND BY YOU CONTRADICTED.

IN page 91, you begin thus: "As to the proposition of Mr. Rogers, that the visible church may, and from time to time hath erred, both in doctrine and conversation, this appears from experience, or matter of fact, as the church of Jerusalem, Alexandria, Antioch, &c.: and we confess that the church of England did err before our reformation, by following the errors of the church of Rome." You are resolved to strike home now, Sir, by daring to pretend to evince the thing by "experience and matter of fact." The churches of Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch have erred; this is the "matter of fact". But what does it prove, Sir? Only that those three particular churches erred, and this is all. But this is tar too weak to strike the whole visible or catholic church. You are the master of argument, Mr. Ritschel, and may reform the science of logic, as well as religion, if you can make this pass for good. A part hath erred, therefore the whole hath erred. Bravely argued, Mr. Ritschel! Three particular churches in the eastern part of the world, two of them in Asia, the third in Africa, have erred, therefore all other churches in the whole christian world, yea, the whole catholic church, hath erred, and that at the same time those three particulars erred. Solidly argued, Sir! Twenty eggs are brought up to your table: you eat three of them; (this is a matter of fact) therefore you have at the same time eaten the whole score. Is this, also matter of fact, Mr. Ritschel? But there is an

"&c," placed after the word Antioch. Pray, Sir, why did you place that "&c." there? Would you by it bring into the number of the erroneous all the rest of the particular churches in the universe? Yet this you must do before you can make it appear matter of fact, that the visible church erred. By this, "&c" you resemble those large-souled evidences in Oates' Plot who swore to &c.'s. You will gain no credit by imitating them. And thus much for your matter of fact.

Now for your experience. "We (protestants) confess that the church of England did err before our reformation by following the errors of the church of Rome": therefore, it appears from experience the visible church may and has erred.-Here is an argument just like the former, both worthy your learned quill, Mr. Ritschel. We protestants confess the church of England did err: therefore, the whole church of England did err. Well, Sir, you confess this: but, suppose this confession of yours is a false confession, and the church of England did not err in faith before your pretended reformation: how finely we shall be imposed upon! I must therefore, by your favour, Sir, require you to prove, first, that the church of Rome had any errors in faith for the church of England to follow: and, secondly, that the church of England was actually involved in those errors when you began to reform. What evidence do you bring for the church of Rome being in error when Luther pretended to reform it? or, that the church of England was erroneous when Cranmer set on foot his pretended reformation? Just none at all, besides themselves. Luther is his own evidence; Cranmer is witness for himself; both in their own cause. And shall we believe one Luther, or one Cranmer, against the whole catholic church? Is a single Cranmer of more credit than the whole visible church of Christ? If you are rational, Mr.

Ritschel, consult your reason upon this. Suppose Mr. Jones, your chaplain, should set up for reformer of your protestant church, and should deny twenty or thirty of your thirty-nine articles, and assert a contrary position of his own, would you not think it more reasonable to believe your whole church against Jones, than Jones alone against it? I doubt not but you would. And, by the same parity of reasoning, you are to believe the church of Rome against one single Luther, rather than Luther against it. If you side with Luther you must likewise, in this supposed case, join in judgment with Jones. If you agree with Luther or Cranmer against the church in being when they began, you must also, by the same reason, become an Arian with Arius, a Manichee with Manes, a Pelagian with Pelagius, a Mahometan with Mahomet; in short, you must never speak nor think of any arch-heretic or apostate that has ever opposed the church since the days of Simon Magus, but you must immediately be of his judgment. This is true, if you aet according to that pretended reason by which you follow Luther, Cranmer, or Parker, against the church in being when they began. If you are a christian, and believe Christ to be the Son of God, you must of necessity (if your malice be a grain less than that of devils) give credit to his divine word and sacred promises, rather than to Luther, Cranmer, or your church of England contradicting him. son of God bids us hear the church; Luther, on the contrary, says, hear me not the church; for the church has erred: Cranmer and your other pretended reformers say the same. Thus, in effect, say all pretended reformers whatsoever. The Son of God promises that the gates of hell shall not prevail against his church. Your church of England, on the contrary, proposes it in Rogers as a point of her faith that "the church

of Christ may, and from time to time has erred in faith and doctrine": which is to say, that the gates of hell both may and have prevailed against her. The Son of God promises to be with his church to the end of the world: he promises also to send her the Holy Ghost, the spirit of truth, to guide her into all truth; St. Paul, from the dictates of the Holy Ghost, calls the church the spouse of Christ, without spot or wrinkle, but holy and without blemish. On the contrary, you protestants teach, that she may and has been stained, and defiled with corruptions in faith. The same holy apostle calls her the church of God, the house of the living God, the pillar and ground of truth: on the contrary, you protestants will needs have her the house of Antichrist, superstitious, idolatrous, and the ground of error (as is shewn from your homilies and other authors). Read the prophecies of Isaiah concerning Christ's church, chap 54, 59, 60, 62. See also, Ezech. chap. 37, and Daniel, the 2, 4, 7. In these you will see the beauty, glory, extent, perpetual duration, immaculate purity, sanctity, and incorruptibility of Christ's church foretold by the Holy. Ghost speaking of them. The prophet Daniel speaking of Christ and his holy church, chap. 7. says, There was given him dominion, and glory, and kingdom that all people, nations and languages should serve him. His dominion is ane vertasting dominion which shall not be taken away: and his kingdom shall not be corrupted. I tell you, Sir, you must either renounce this damnable doctrine of the visible church of Christ, the catholic church's being corrupted with errors in faith; and, on the contrary, hold her always pure, holy, unspotted, and unblemished with errors or deformity in doctrine, yea incorruptible and infallible, or else you set up yourself in open rebellion, and diametrical opposition against the holy prophets, against the apostles,

against the whole church and kingdom of Christ, and against Christ himself. Cease then your heretical and diabolical boldness, and never stand longer in open contradiction to God himself. I have some reason to hope you will follow this advice, Sir; for, notwithstanding your holding that "the visible church may and has erred," yet, in the next page, you are forced (though with great reluctance) to own the contrary. You there say, "the proposition, that the visible church may and has erred, does not give the lie to the Son of God; for that promise of Christ to his church; Matt. 16. that the gates of hell shall not prevail against it, is made to his church in general; that all the powers of the kingdom of darkness shall never be able totally to extirpate the true faith of Christ, and destroy its professors from the face of the earth."

In this paragraph of yours is to be observed, first, that you are unwilling to part with your propositions. Secondly, that you are both, in plain words, to contradict the Son of God: and then to go about to reconcile the contradiction. But, in so doing, you have utterly ruined your proposition; nor, indeed, could it possibly be otherwise, for contradictions can never be made to agree, one side necessarily destroying the other, and it is but just that truth should have the mastery. Your saving, that "Christ's promise is made to his church in general," that is, to the catholic church or visible church: (for this you must mean by the word "general," if you durst but speak out) that its faith, the true faith of Christ, shall never be extirpated," utterly destroys your beloved proposition, "that the visible church may and has erred in faith;" for if the church in general (to give it your own word) be by Christ's promise secured from error in faith, as it must be if the true faith of Christ

and its professors can never be extirpated nor destroyed, as you truly own; then the church in general or visible church, neither can, may, nor ever has erred in faith. You afterwards confirm this great truth by owning the catholic church to be the pillar and ground of truth, although this concession necessarily breaks the neck of your church's impious propositions. You deliver your words thus. " Nor does the doctrine, that the visible church may and has erred, contradict that of St. Paul, 1 Tim. 3, that the church is the ground and pillar of truth, since by the church, in that place, we cannot absolutely understand any particular church, but the catholic church." Thus you; and is not this enough, Sir, that the catholic church is the pillar and ground of truth, and that Christ has secured the catholic church from error? This is all I dispute for, and this now, at last, you have granted.

After all this, be pleased to tell me, Sir, how you can defend Mr. Rogers' proposition from contradicting our Saviour and St. Paul? You own, that Christ has promised that the gates of hell shall not prevail against his church, and that the faith of Christ shall never totally be extirpated, nor all its professors destroyed from off the face of the earth, and that the catholic church is the pillar and ground of truth, as St. Paul says; and yet you have the confidence, all this while, to tell us that the visible church—the catholic church, may and hath erred, and to affirm, that this proposition does not give the lie to the Son of God, nor contradict St. Paul! If to say, that the catholic church can never err, and the catholic church may and has erred, be not a contradiction, nothing is.

But let me give you your due, Sir. You knew this to be a contradiction when you wrote, and therefore, for reconciling it, you endeavour,

either to change the state of the question from the error of the catholic church or visible church, to that of a particular church; or, at least, so far to insinuate into your heedless readers, that, when Mr. Rogers says, the visible church may and has erred in faith, he meant no more but only that a particular church may and has erred; for you say that "that promise of Christ was made to the church in general, &c. and that it gave no warrant or security to any particular church or member of it, that it shall not fall from the true faith into error and heresy. And, when St. Paul calls the church the ground and pillar of truth, we cannot understand any particular church, but the catholic church; nor doth it follow from that passage, but that any particular church, or member of it, may embrace error and heresy." Thus you go on, as if the question between us was about the error of a particular church; since you know, as well as you know your right hand from your left, that I never contended with you about the erring or not erring of particular churches; for I know, as well as you do, that particular churches may err, and that particular churches have fallen into heresy. We have too sad an example of it in these wretched national churches of England and Scotland, which, by their pretended reformations, erred from the catholic faith, from the visible church of Christ, into the abominable errors of protestancy and presbyterianism. I brought the said texts of scripture against you and Rogers' propositions, to prove that the catholic church, the visible church, or (as you have a conceit to call it) the church in general, can never become erroneous, nor corrupt in faith, but is inerrible and infallible. It was for this reason I cited the said texts of scripture, and so powerful are those sacred words, that you dare not, nor cannot resist their force;

but, in despite of heretical obstinacy and infernal malice, you are forced to own, in plain words, that the promise of Christ to his church, "that the gates of hell shall not prevail against it, is made to the church in general, that all the powers of the kingdom of darkness shall never be able totally to extirpate the true faith of Christ, and all its professors from off the face of the earth. By the church, when St. Paul calls it the pillar and ground of truth, is to be understood the catholic church." These are your own words, Sir, and as much as I desire from you: for they own plainly the catholic church to be the pillar and ground of truth, secured by our Saviour from ever loosing the true faith, or wanting professors of it; which, in very deed, is to say, that the catholic church never has erred, nor never can err in faith, but is infallible. This, I say, is all I contended for, and you thus plainly granting it, what further occasion was there for your confounding and blundering the thing with impertinencies, and a deal of nonsense about particular churches erring or not crring, when no one ever denied but they both may and have erred! The bottom of all this protestant policy is, to reconcile the doctrine of the church of England, "that the visible church may, and from time to time has erred" with the doctrine of Christ and his apostles "that the eatholic church cannot possibly err, or be corrupted by all the powers of hell, but is always the ground of truth." But all will not do, Mr. Ritschel. Christ and Mr. Rogers can never be reconciled: St. Paul and Mr. Rogers can never agree. The infallibility of the church of Christ being thus granted and owned by you, never trouble yourself about Rogers' doctrine; let him and the church of England that approved and licenced his propositions, defend it as well as they can. It is your business to stick to the

truth you have owned, to wit, that the catholic church is the ground of truth, secured by Christ's promise from ever loosing the true faith of Christ, that is (if you can but digest the expression) the catholic church is infallible.

CHAP. VI.

THAT THE PROTESTANTS HAVE MADE ARTICLES OF FAITH, CLEARLY DEMONSTRATED.

In your's of March 4th. you told me that "your reformers did not make a new creed, or articles of faith." In my answer to that letter, I instanced several articles among your thirty-nine that were new, and such as the catholic church never held; as the sixth, ninth, eleventh, thirteenth and nineteenth. These you now undertake to defend in the third section of your book; but, in such a manner, that, instead of proving their antiquity, you demonstrate their novelty by owning (as you ought) for the ancient catholic faith doctrines quite contrary to them,

What you say concerning the sixth article I shall not take notice of in this place, but defer it till I come to examine your section relating to scripture, which shall be in a treatise apart when time serves

for it.

In my examination of these four following articles I shall, first, set down your own particular doctrine, Mr. Ritschel, as delivered in your own words, and then give you my opinion of it. After this you shall have the doctrine of the article. I will begin with

The ninth article.

In your discourse upon this you declare your

own particular doctrine in these words. "We say, that there is in and by baptism a full pardon of all sins, both original and actual, through the merits and satisfaction of the sufferings of Christ." Thus you: and indeed you say very well; and if you believe what you say it is still better. If this had been the doctrine of the article, I should never have called it new, for what you say here is catholic doctrine, and as old as christianity itself.

But the article teaches quite the contrary, when it expressly says that "original sin remains, yea, in them that are regenerated; yea, in God's dear children," (says Rogers) and concupiscence, even in the regenerated, is sin." And your church, by Mr. Rogers, puts them down for adversaries to truth, and their doctrine for error, who hold that "baptism once received, there is in the baptised no sin at all." Therefore, the church of England, in this her ninth article, and in her explanation of it, teaches for faith, a doctrine new, false and heretical.

Of the eleventh article.

Your own particular doctrine you deliver thus. "When we say, faith alone justifieth, we do not understand such a faith as is alone, without good works, without repentance, hope and charity." You understand right then, Mr. Ritschel, for this is the catholic doctrine, and as old as christianity: and, indeed, if the article had delivered such an understanding of itself, I should never have called But it teaches quite the contrary when it says, "we are justified by faith alone"; and, in your church's explanation of it by Mr. Rogers, places them under the title of adversaries to truth, and pronounces their doctrine erroneous who teach, "that man is justified by faith and works." Therefore this eleventh article, as explained by your church, teaches for faith, a doctrine new, false and heretical.

Of the thirteenth article.

You declare your own particular doctrine thus: "some actions are simply, and in their own nature good, and commanded by God, as acts of justice and mercy, temperance and sobriety; and these are those works about which we dispute, &c.: now we do not say that those noble and glorious actions of the ancient heroes and heathen philosophers, as their singular courage and constancy, justice, patience and temperance; &c., whereby they have justly eternized their memories, we do not say, that these noble actions of unregenerated men are simply and in their own nature evil, but, on the other hand, we say, that they are both honest and laudible, and that God hath commanded them to be done." This is well said, Sir, and what I do not accuse as new or false doctrine: for it is catholic. But your article teaches the contrary, affirming positively, that "works, done before justification and the grace of God, have the nature of sin." And your church, by Rogers, gives her further explanation of it thus. "Whatsoever men do, not yet justified before God, is sin. For of such persons, the best works which they do, even their fasting, praying, alms-deeds, sacrificing to God, prophecies, and working of miracles even in the name of Christ: yea, all their actions whatsoever, are abominable before God."

Therefore the doctrine of this thirteenth article, as explained by your church, is new, false and heretical.

You Sir, like not at all this doctrine of your church, and, therefore, by your way of distinguishing it, would very gladly impose upon her, whether she will or no, a better sense of the article than ever she meant or designed it should have, putting your own explanation of it for her's in these words: "though these things (the works

of unregenerated men) be good in themselves, yet not being rightly done, and being attended with such evil circumstances, as hypocrisy, interest, vain glory, vain applause, &c.: as by you above, which change the nature of moral actions, and make them evil, we say they have the nature of sin." "And this," you say, "I take to be the sense of the church of England in this point." I answer, it is not your taking it so, that can make it so; for you wilfully mistake the sense of your church. You may see her sense put down in the former page. It is nothing like this of your's. She mentions not, nor takes the least notice at all of any such circumstance, whereby the case may be changed, but is positive that, "all works whatsoever, yea, even the best works she can think on, have the nature of sin, and are abominable before God." She tells you further, to make sure work of what she means, that, "the council of Trent hath erred, in pronouncing them accursed who hold that all works of men whatsoever, done before justification, are sin." This, Sir, is the sense of your church: and all the texts of scripture applied by Rogers are falsely applied and misinterpreted by him to signify this sense, by his saving from them, "whatsoever men do is sin."

I would have you and your church of England tell me, whether the fasting of the Ninevites, their prayers, and clothing themselves with sackcloth; the prayers and fastings of Cornelius (being yet unbaptised); the Ethiopian eunuch's reading the prophecy of Isaiah; the publican's going up to the temple to pray, and smiting his breast with that humble prayer of, God be merciful to me a sinner, &c.;—tell me, I say, whether these works, for they were all done before justification, were sins. To say they were, I suppose you dare not: and, to say they were not, is to contradict your

L

church's doctrine, that, "all works whatsoever are sins, if done before justification."

Now, Sir, what you have argued for, all this while, in defence of the article, is only to bring works done to a bad end, or with an ill intention, under the nature of sin: and this no one denies, for it is the catholic doctrine and what the church ever held. But, what you should also have shewn us is, that the article and explication teaches, that works done by unjustified men, without any indirect or ill intention, but rather for a good end and with a good intention, (as were those above named) have not the nature of sin, and are not sins. But this you have not done; for it is impossible: because, as it is said, your church affirming without exception, that "the best, yea, all works whatsoever, so done, have the nature of sin and are sin," includes as well works done without any ill design, or for a good end, as others done with a bad intention, or an ill end. This doctrine, I tell you therefore, is both new, fulse and heretical; yea, and of pernicious consequence, as being destructive and a hinderance to the doing of all moral good works by such as know themselves in the state of mortal sin: for they may well think it is better to do nothing at all, than to do that which, by a point of faith, they are obliged to hold and believe to be a sin.

Of the nineteenth article.

Your own doctrine upon this article is, that "all the powers of the kingdom of darkness shall never be able totally to extirpate the true faith of Jesus Christ, &c. The catholic church is the pillar and ground of truth, &c. God has had a true church, teaching the true faith or true religion in all ages." If your article had been like this, I should, instead of calling it new, have declared it catholic doctrine, and as old as the church itself. But, as your church words it, and

after explains it by Mr. Rogers, it teaches the contrary doctrine, saying, "the churches of Jerusalem, Alexandria, Antioch, have erred; (this is not all) the church of Rome hath erred in faith: (more yet) the visible church may, and hath erred in doctrine: and (so far as by the homily on the thirty-fifth article) the whole world, or whole christendom, has been drowned in damnable idolatry for above eight hundred years, to the extirpation of all good religion universally." It is evident, therefore, that this doctrine of your church and article is new, false and heretical. Besides, the first part of this nineteenth article contradicts, in plain terms, your church's doctrine in its second part, as well as Mr. Rogers' explanation of the second part of it, viz. that the visible church may, and hath erred in faith and doctrine. For the first part of the article teaches, that "the visible church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in the which the pure word of God is preached, and the sacraments duly administered, according to Christ's ordinance in all those things that are of necessity requisite for the same": and this is true catholic doctrine. But the following part of the article, and Mr. Rogers' proposition in it, teaching, that "the visible church may, and hath erred in faith and doctrine," must needs be new, false and heretical, if the first be true, as it certainly is: and stands in direct contradiction to it. For, how can it be truly said the church errs in faith and doctrine, when, at the same time, it teaches the pure word of God, and duly administers the sacraments according to Christ's ordinance? Rogers tells you, that "the church is not many congregations, but one company of faithful for time and continuance in all ages, even from our first parents: and it may rightly be called a catholic church." This I note

to you out of Rogers, that you may see him own a visible catholic church in all ages, preaching the pure word of God and duly administering the sacraments, which could not possibly be, if the church erred in any age or was "drowned in damnable idolatry for above eight hundred years together, and the pure preaching of the word of God totally laid aside (as the homily says) and left off soon after the apostles' times to the extirpation of all good religion universally." This is enough, Sir, to evidence to you the novelty and heresy of the four said articles.

I have no time (nor matters it) to take notice how the force of miseducation, the bias of prejudice, and heretical wrangling, have striven, and wrestled against your reason, before they could be got to suffer truth to extort the said sound doctrines, in contradiction to the articles, from your pen. Only give me leave to exhort you, hereafter to arm yourself with a true christian courage, boldly and freely to own and embrace the truth whenever it presents itself. Confess Christ before men, that he may own you before his

Of the twenty-second, twenty-fifth, and thirty-first articles.

Father.

We come now to examine how you defend these from novelty. In the twenty-second, your church of England (as you call it) obliges her members to hold for points of faith, first, that there is no purgatory: secondly, that pardons are vain: thirdly, that sacred images are not to be honoured with absolute honour: fourthly, that the relies of saints are not to be honoured: fifthly, that the saints of heaven are not to be invocated, or desired to pray for us. The twenty-fifth article imposes upon you five other new points of faith: first, that confirmation is no sacrament: secondly, that penance is no sacrament: thirdly, that

order is no sacrament: fourthly, that extreme unction is no sacrament: fifthly, that marriage

(in the church of God) is no sacrament.

The thirty-first article defines for a point of your protestant faith, that "the sacrifice of the mass is a blasphemous fable and dangerous deceit." In these three articles are no less than eleven new

points of faith.

These, as well as the former articles, I objected against you in my answer to your first letter, to which in your book, page 102, you ridiculously reply thus; "I answer that these are points in controversy between us, and no point of the doctrine of the church of England, except in a negative sense, in that she denies them to be any part of the catholic faith." Thus you argue, and it seems you have got part of this absurd notion out of Stillingfleet, who took it from Bramhall.

First, you say they are points in controversy between us: and what then? what, I pray, would you infer from this? would you not have them accounted for points of faith, because they are points of controversy? This, it seems, is what you would be at, if you durst speak clearly and intelligibly out, as may be gathered from your following with their being, "no points of your church's doctrine, except in a negative sense;" as if a negative could not be a point of faith. I believe there is a purgatory: if you do not, is not this a point of your faith? You would gladly deny them, I find, to be points of your faith, because you cannot defend them from novelty and falsehood. On the other hand, having, at your ordination, declared your belief of them, subscribed to them, and swore upon a book to defend them, you dare not, for your life, positively deny them to be points of your faith, but plainly hold them for points of your church's doctrine, still only it must be forsooth in a negative sense. Know you not, that doctrines or points of faith, that are new and heretical, are not less heretical for being negative than for being affirmative? The Arian heresy, in denying the Son of God to be of the same substance with the Father, was a negative article: yet it was as false as that of the Manichees, which affirmed there were two Gods. You must understand, Sir, that he who positively denies, always adds the contrary to what he takes away: and that he who makes it an article of faith that there is no purgatory, no mass, no praying to saints, no sacraments &c. has as many articles as he who holds the contrary.

But, by your favour, Sir, in your twenty second, twenty fifth, and thirty first articles, there are not only negative doctrines, but affirmative also. twenty second, besides denying five points above named, further affirms them to be "fond things vainly invented, and grounded upon no warrant of scripture, but rather repugnant to the word of God." The twenty-fifth, besides its denying the said five to be sacraments, does also further affirm them to have "grown up of the corrupt following the Apostles" &c. The thirty-first not only denies the mass, but it also affirms it to be "a blasphemous fable and dangerous deceit;" so that your denying them to be affirmative doctrines of your church does but only discover your ignorance of what they do affirm.

If you had as much confidence to contradict your church as your masters Stillingfleet and Bramhall had, your sentence would not have been so nonsensically confused, nor your meaning

so ambigious and unintelligible.

Stillingfleet, in his defence of Archbishop Laud page 54, tells us, that "the church of England makes no articles of faith, but such as have the testimony of the whole christian world in all ages acknowledged to be such by Rome itself: and in

other things she requires subscription to them, not as articles of faith, but inferior truths, which she expects a submission to, in order to her peace and tranquility." After this, page 82 and 104, he distinguishes between the "internal assent of the will," and "the external act." "The church," says he, "doth not require the first, but the latter." To conclude what he says, he quotes Archbishop Bramhall thus: "neither doth the church of England defend any of these questions as necessarv to be believed either necessitate medii, or necessitate præcepti, which is much less, but only bindeth her sons, for the sake of peace, not to oppose them. Again, we do not suffer any man to reject the thirty nine articles of the church of England at his pleasure; neither do we look upon them as essentials of saving faith or legacies of Christ and his apostles, but as a means, as pious opinions fitted for the preservation of unity. Neither do we oblige any man to believe them, but only not to contradict them." Thus Bramhall's doctrine is delivered by Stillingfleet, In another place, as cited by Schism dispatched page 543, "we (says Bramhall) neither hold it an article of faith, that there is a purgatory, nor, that there is none." You, poor pedant, not quarter fledged with courage, stand boggling whether for a penny you should hold them for points of faith or no: and then come off with "they are not in points of our church's doctrine in an affirmative sense, but in a negative sense they are." But Bramhall and Stillingfleet, those sons of Priam, never hesitate to strike off all the monstrous heads of their mother church's faith at one stroke, by ever saying by your leave, madam: or so much as ever taking notice that she entitles them all "the catholic doctrine believed and professed in the church of England" and gives all to the devil by excommunieation who deny them.

Stillingfleet will have none of all the thirty nine to be articles of faith, but only such as are acknowledged to be so even "by Rome itself," and this annihiliates twenty-six, or twenty-eight, if not thirty of the number. Nay, he goes further telling you; "the church does not require the internal assent of the mind (to any of them) the external act (of subscription) is all she requires." And this leaves every man at liberty whether he will believe any one of them all for an article of faith or no.-The church of England, says Bramhall, only binds her sons, not to oppose them. "Neither do we oblige any man to believe them, but only not to oppose them." What a brave confession of faith they have dwindled it to now: that every one may, if he please, disbelieve every article of it: a precious method to preserve unity! According to this the Cerinthians, Arians, Pelagians, Socinians, anabaptists, quakers, Jews, Turks, yea, atheists themselves, may subscribe the thirty nine articles, and be naturalized sons of the church of England, if they ean but keep their tongues from contradicting them, though they do not believe one single article of them all: here is no tie or restraint of conscience or inward assent of the mind at all put upon them.

How grossly your godly reformed brethren, the protestant churches beyond seas, are imposed upon and deceived, when, taking those thirty-nine articles for the church of England's confession of faith, and supposing her members obliged to believe them all to be true, perhaps neither she herself, nor any protestant in England believes any one of them. "The church of England requires not subscriptions to them as articles of faith, she requires not the internal assent of the mind She defines not any of those questions as necessary to be believed. See does not look upon them as essential to saving faith. Neither does she

oblige any man to believe them." Here is an indulgent mother! You, her sons, may believe or disbelieve any of her doctrines just as you please, if you only refrain from speaking what you think!

But whither are we run, Mr. Ritschel? The charges I laid against the said articles was novelty and heresy. And what do you say to this? What do I say? indeed these are points of controversy between us, therefore-These are no points of the doctrine of the church of England except in a negative sense, therefore-Bravely argued, Sir, because they are points of controversy, they are neither new nor heretical: because they are negatives they are neither new nor heretical. Here is all that can be inferred from what you say in that paragraph. But what do you advance further? "You must first prove the church of Rome to be the true church of God; and that these, and the other doctrines retained in your church, are agreeable to the word of God, the analogy of faith, and the doctrines of the primitive church, before you can condemn us for rejecting them." This is all impertinent and not to the question, whether they be new and heretical. But, as to what you require, I answer, when Luther first denied those points of our faith he had against him the testimonies of millions of witnesses both bishops, priests, doctors, and laity, all unanimously believing the church of Rome to be the true church of God, the holy catholic church; and attesting the said points of faith, contradicted by you, to be the received doctrines of the catholic church, delivered to them then living by their immediate forefathers, whose immediate forefathers also attested the same to have been so delivered to them from theirs: and so from hand to hand even from the apostles themselves who received it from Christ.

Thus we catholics were in full possession of the said doctrines, as part of our heritage or catholic

faith, received from our ancestors from time immemorial, when you protestants began first to oppose them. If you protestants, then, dare be so impudently bold as to pretend to dispossess us of them, you must make a better title than this against our universal and perpetual tradition.-Who denied the said catholic doctrines in the year 1517? Only one single man, Martin Luther. Who held them for points of faith at that time? All that vast and innumerable multitude of ehristians dispersed through the whole christian world, who then held communion with St. Peter's suecessor, the pope of Rome, that is, the whole catholie eliurch. Now, let any man in his right wits judge, whether it is more reasonable to believe the universal church, consisting of millions of millions of living witnesses affirming, or to believe one single Luther denying?—yea, and this Luther the most profligate wretch then living, notoriously scandalous for his disobedience, for his sacrilegiously breaking his vows, for his pride, lust, familiarity with the devils, (as he himself eonfesses) and for all manner of wickedness; yea, even marked by divine justice for a reprobate by his fearful and sudden death, being, after a feasting and drunken supper, found dead in his bed at two o'elock in the morning, supposed by protestants themselves to be killed by the devil, as shall be shown more at large hereafter. In short, the catholic church, holding them for points of faith when Luther opposed them, is sufficient evidence, yea, the very best and most undeniable evidence in the world, that they are matters or points of faith, or, to use your own words, "agreeable to the word of God, the analogy of faith and the doctrines of the primitive church." And that the catholic church then held them for points of catholic faith, is evident from Luther's denying them to be such, as also from the church condemning

him and his followers for denying them. Nor can you shew so much as any one man in the world that did not own them for points of catholic faith at that very time, immediately before Luther began to oppose them. (The supremacy only excepted, which the eastern schismatics deny.)

Well, as to the twenty-second and thirty-first, and the denial of the five sacraments, mentioned in the twenty-fifth article, you have not said one word more in behalf of their antiquity or orthodoxy. I therefore conclude, that all those ten negative points of protestant faith are new, false and heretical. And it seems you are content to let them all pass for such; only the sacrament of marriage you are resolved shall never be accounted a sacrament. You argue against it from your definition of a sacrament. A sacrament you define to be "an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace, ordained by Christ himself," &c.: but marriage, you say, was not ordained by Christ, but by God himself in paradise: therefore, in your logic, marriage must not be a sacrament. This is argued like a protestant divine. It was not ordained by Christ but by God; therefore, it is no sacrament. It seems, then, by this your logic, that Christ can ordain a sacrament, but God cannot. Away with such blasphemous nonsense!

Then you demand "what outward elements are there ordained by God for the conveyance of his grace?" But, must it not be a sacrament, good Mr. Ritschel, because there is no outward element? In your definition of a sacrament you mention no outward element. If outward elements be absolutely necessary, then your defininition is lame and imperfect, Pray, what outward element is there in the sacrament of ordination? yet, your famous bishop Bramhall owns ordination to be a sacrament? "We deny not

ordination to be a sacrament," says he in his defence of the church of England's ordination. What outward element is there in the sacrament of penance? Yet your first schoolmasters, the Germans, whom you so often style your godly reformed bretheren, in their confession of faith, presented to the emperor Charles the 5th. at Augsburg, in the name of all the protestants, anno 1530, reckon penance a sacrament, as well as baptism and the eucharist. Do you think God cannot convey his grace into the hearts of the married couple without the help of an outward element? This is solid divinity and sound logic of yours: because there is no outward element, therefore there is no grace conveyed. In the sacrament of extreme unction there is appointed the outward element of oil, and grace promised. Why, then, do you not account this for a sacrament? Can you require any more in a sacrament than is appointed in this? yet your new article will not have this a sacrament. You are neither content when you have outward elements, nor when you want them. Protestant, all is over!

Examine the Latin Bible (if you please) and you will find St. Paul, in his fifth chapter to the Ephesians verse 32, affirming marriage to be a great sacrament: this is a great sacrament, says he, but I speak in Christ and the church. Seeing that holy apostle held marriage a sacrament in the church, I see no reason why we should not believe him that it is so, rather than Mr. Ritschel denying "The good of marriage among the people of God is in the holiness of a sacrament," says the great St. Augustine lib de bono conjuguli c. 24. And in his book de Fide et operibus c. 7, the same holy father says: "In the church not only the bond of marriage but also the sacrament is so commended that it is not lawful for the husband to deliver his wife to another." He calls it a sacrament

in many other places of his works. The great council of Florence defined it a sacrament; so also the council of Trent, yet Mr. Ritschel would have us believe it is none, against two general councils, against the great St. Augustine, against the holy apostle St. Paul, against God himself whom you own to have instituded it. In short, the catholic church holding it a sacrament, when Luther and your other carnal and impure apostates first denied it, is evidence undeniable that it is a sacrament.

I wonder, Sir, why you struck only against marriage being a sacrament, and let pass the other four denied in your article, seeing you lie under the same obligation of proving them no sacraments as you do for this? You either have nothing to say against the other four, or else you cast out those insignificant arguments only against this on purpose to move me to prove it a sacrament, that you may dare hereafter to venture upon a wife without danger of sullying your sanctity. Holy man! Well, Sir, seeing I have done you the kindness to prove it a sacrament, never scruple hereafter, but marry in the fear of the Lord. But, to return to your thirty-nine articles, I eharge several others of them for new and heretical.

The twenty-eight article.

By this you are obliged to believe, that, in the the holy sacrament of the eucharist, the substance of bread and wine is not changed or transubstantiated into the body and blood of Christ.

The thirty-fifth article.

This obliges you to believe all that is contained in the two books of homilies (though I am eonfident many young parsons, when they swear to this article, have never seen them) for godly and wholesome doctrine. That homily against peril of idolatry (as is noted above) teaches, first, that the preaching of God's word (soon after the time of

the apostles) became corrupt, and, lastly, altogether omitted: secondly, that laity and clergy, learned and unlearned of all ages, sexes and degrees of men, women and children of whole christendom, have been at once drowned in abominable idolatry, and that for the space of more than eight hundred years: thirdly, that all good religion was universally destroyed.

Here are three points of doctrine which you are obliged by the thirty-fifth article to believe for godly and wholesome. For my part, I take them for the most impious and pestilential that any heretic ever broached. And I affirm them to be new and heretical, yea, diabolical. De-

fend them as well as you can, parson.

If I pleased to examine the rest of your whole-some homilies, I doubt not but there might be found a great many other new and heretical points of protestant faith; but, be there as many as there will, your church by this article has bound you, under excommunication, to believe them all. And you, easy soul, were content to swear to them all when you took orders. A godly and whole-some outh! An excellent preparative of a parson's concience, to fit it to swallow whatever comes to hand as long as he lives, without the least check of a squeamish stomach!

The thirty-sixth article

This imposes two forms of ordaining priests and consecrating bishops, devised by the child king Edward the sixth, obliging you to believe they contain all things necessary for the consecrating and ordaining bishops and priests, though there is neither priest nor bishop named in them, nor any one word equivalent thereto.—Nay, though they were both rejected and left off in the year 1662 by your protestant pretended bishops and clergy themselves, and other new forms substituted in their place, yet it remains still a point of your

protestant faith in this thirty-sixth article to believe they contained all things necessary; which if they had done there had been no need of devising new ones in which both the name bishop and priest, and their offices, are expressly set down.

Thus, Sir, I have counted in the said article above twenty points of protestant faith all new and heretical.—Yet you have the confidence repeatedly to assert that your glorious reformers did

not make any new articles of faith.

Note, Sir, that when I call your protestant doctrines new, I know your pretended reformers did not invent them all themselves, but have gathered many of them out of the pestiferous asles of formerly condemned heretics. For example,

Acrius, the heretic, was the first that denied prayers and sacrifices to be profitable to the souls in purgatory. But his heresy was opposed by the Augustine, St. Chrysostom, St. Gregory, Theophylact &c. and condemned by the fourth council of Carthage. This heresy was also opposed by the Volensian, Toletan and Florentine councils. This heretic held also that all bishops and priests were equal. His error was condemned by St. Augustine in his book de Heresib. This Acrius also maintained that we are not obliged to any certain abstinences.

Jovinian held that fasting is of no moment, but that it is lawful to eat flesh in Lent or on Good

Friday, or any other day whatsoever.

The Armenians and some Greek heretics deny the doctrine of purgatory, in opposition to the catholic tradition. The council of Florence, under pope Eugenius the fourth, is said to have confirmed this doctrine against them.

Eustachius broached the heresy that it is not lawful to honour or pray to the saints in heaven. This was condemned as heretical in the council of Gangres, afterwards in the council of Orleans, and others.

Eunomius, the heretic, taught that the relics of saints were not to be kept or reverenced. After him Vigilantius held the same. St. Jerom wrote against this heresy and against Vigilantius for holding it. The council of Lateran under pope Innocent the 3rd. condemned this heresy.

The Iconoclasts broke down sacred images in churches, and for impugning them were condemned by three-hundred and fifty bishops, in the

second council of Nice.

The Waldensian, and Albigensian heretics denied the power of indulgences, pardon or remission of temporal punishments. From these sprung your twenty-second article.

John de Welesia held that the council might err. He was condemned at Mentz, in the time of the

emperor Frederic the third.

Arius, that arch-heretic, taught that general councils approved by the pope might err. Nestorius, Eutyches, Dioscorus, Huss and Wickliff held the same. These heretics were condemned in general councils. This heresy has been opposed by the learned writings of Occam, Chiltoverius, Eccius and others.

Berengarius first publicly denied the real presence of Christ's body and blood in the holy sacrament of the eucharist; his damnable heresy was condemned in the councils at Verseilles, Tyrone, Rome, Florence and Trent. St. Langfranc, archbishop of Canterbury, and many others wrote against him. No one article of the christian faith, now in debate between protestants and the catholic church, is more strongly testified and defended in the writings of the holy fathers, than this of the real presence, as you may see in their testimonies set down by Jodocus Coccius in his

Thesau: Cath: and in Gaulterus Tabul: Chron: See also Heskit in his parliament of Greek and Latin fathers for the real presence. From him

your twenty-eighth article.

John Wickliff, the English heretic, taught that the sacrifice of the mass was not instituted by Christ. This blasphemous heretic was condemned in the general council of Constance. That Christ himself instituted this great christian sacrifice is expressly asserted by the ancient fathers, St. Ambrose, St. Augustine, St. Cyprian, St. Chrysostom, pope Alexander the first, Eusebius, Isidore and many others, as you may see in the above mentioned authors Coccius and Gaulterus, if you have not the works of the holy fathers by you. It is also defined in many councils, as in the sixth general council, the Toletan and Lateran, &c. See 32 decret. From him your thirty-first article.

Ennomius, the heretie, broached that faith alone was sufficient to salvation without good works.

Acrius held also that no sin is imputed to a believer. I should rather have called him the author of the heresy of faith alone, for Eunomius was his scholar. From this you draw your eleventh article.

Read the works of St. Augustine, St. Ireneus, St. Epiphanius against heretics, and you will understand more at large whence your protestants pretended reformers derive their impious, blasphemous, and heretical doctrines. And it may likewise be seen in the works of your own protestant writer Alexander Ross, in his view of all religions, out of what daughill of condemned heresies you have picked up your new ereed.

And, in conclusion, I must tell you, that take your thirty-nine articles, or new creed, altogether as it stands, and neither Christians, Jews, Turks, infidels, schismatics or heretics of any one sort ever

had the like since the world began.

CHAP. VII.

THE PROTESTANT CHURCH OF ENGLAND DENOUNCES
HER ANATHEMAS OR EXCOMMUNICATIONS AGAINST
ALL SUCH AS DENY THIS HER NEW CREED.

I remember I told you something to this purpose in my answer to your first letter; at which you were so much offended that you charged me with misrepresenting you. "This is plain (you say) that you have misrepresented us, in saying we denounce anathemas to all those who refuse to conform and subscribe to them (the thirty-nine articles:) if it be so, it is matter of fact and matter of record."

To this I answer, if it is not matter of fact and matter of record, then I have misrepresented you, and I detest misrepresentation. But, if it is matter of fact and matter of record, then I shall have no need to beg your pardon. Examine then your ecclesiastical canons made in the year 1604. There you will find this matter of fact (as you call it) standing upon record. But perhaps you may fall again to distinguishing, and reply, that those excommunications are not anathemas. To prevent this nicety, I tell you before hand, out of Rogers himself, that "he, who is excommunicated, is delivered over to satan." And pray, Sir, what greater curse or anathema can you give a man than to give him to the devil. But to the devil you actually give all whosoever deny conformity to your said new creed, the thirty-nine articles: which matters of fact, in compliance with your ignorance, I shall here again record.

Canon the Third.

"Whosoever shall hereafter affirm that the church of England, by law established under the majesty of the king, is not a true and an apostolic church, teaching and maintaining the doctrine of the apostles, let him be excommunicated ipso facto, and not restored but by the archbishop after his repentance and public revocation of his wicked error."

Canon the fifth.

"Whosoever shall hereafter affirm, that any of the thirty-nine articles, agreed upon by the archbishops and bishops of both provinces and the whole clergy in the convocation held at London for the year of our Lord 1562 for the avoiding of diversity of opinions, and for the establishing of consent touching true religion, are, in any part, superstitions or erroneous, or such as he may not with good conscience subscribe unto, let him be excommunicated ipso facto, and not restored but only by the archbishop after his repentance and public revocation of such his error,"

Canon the ninth.

"Whosoever shall separate themselves from the communion of the saints, as it is approved by the apostles' rules in the church of England, and combine themselves in a new brotherhood, accounting the Christians, who are conformable to the doctrine, government, rites and ceremonies of the church of England, to be profane and unmeet for them to join with in christian profession, let them be excommunicated ipso facto, and not be restored but by the archbishop" &c. as above.

Besides these excommunications against such as approve not your confession of faith, the thirty-nine articles, your canons likewise offer up for sacrifice unto satan's hands all such as will not conform to your worship, ceremonies and church

government.

Canon the fourth.

"Whosoever shall hereafter affirm that the form of God's worship in the church of England established by law and contained in the book of Common Prayer and administration of sacraments,

is a corrupt, superstitious or unlawful worship of God, or containeth any thing in it that is repugnant to the scriptures; let him be excommunicated ipso facto, and not restored but by the bishop of the place, or archbishop after his repentance and public revocation of such his wicked errors."

Canon the sixth.

"Whosoever shall hereafter affirm, that the rites and ceremonies of the church of England, by law established, are wicked, antichristian, or superstitious; or, such as being commanded by lawful authority, men, who are zealously and godly affected, may not with a good conscience approve them, let him be excommunicated ipso facto, and not restored till he repent and publicly revoke such his wicked errors."

Canon the seventh.

"Whosoever shall hereafter affirm that the government of the church of England, under his majesty, by archbishops, bishops, deans, archdeans, and the rest that are in the same, is antichristian, or repugnant to the word of God, let him be excommunicated ipso facto, and so continue till he repent and publicly revoke such his wicked errors."

Now, Sir, I hope you are satisfied that I have not misrepresented you or your church. Here is matter of fact, and matter of record, enough to clear my innocency, and shew your ignorance. See how little reason you have to blame the church of Rome, as you do, for anothematizing those who wilfully and obstinately refuse her communion. What less, I pray, does your protestant church of England, when she thus fulminates her excommunications against all such as deny or do not conform to any of her thirty-nine articles, common prayer, rites, ceremonics, or lay-magistratical government under your pretended archbishops and bishops. And, how ex-

communicated persons are to be looked upon and avoided your thirty-third article will inform you, in these words; "that person, who, by open denunciation of the church, is rightly cut off from the unity of the church and excommunicated, ought to be taken off the whole multitude of the faithful as a heathen and a publican, until he be openly reconciled by penance, and received into the church by a judge that hath authority thereto." Thus the article; and Mr. Rogers upon it further teaches, that "such an excommunicated person is delivered unto satan, and is not to be eaten with, nor accompanied, nor received

into any body's house."

Consider, now, how unlikely your protestant church of England is to be a part or member of any other church. First, she has, by her pretended reformation incurred the guilt of schism and heresy, as is evident from her forsaking the visible church of Christ, and making to herself a new creed, which also divides her from the faith of the catholic church. And secondly, on the other hand, she has so barricadoed herself on all sides with those excommunications, that not any one of her "godly brethren, the churches of God, God's people, the churches reformed, the churches christianly reformed, the godly reformed, &c. (as your church, by Rogers, styles foreign protestants, and presbyterian congregations) can possibly get entrance through her so strongly bolted gates, without, first, renouncing so much of their own faith, worship, ceremonies, and government as is disagreeable to hers, and owning all that she imposes. Thus, instead of knitting, as you express it, your church to other churches, you have unknit and rejected them all as heathens and publicans, and delivered all those your godly brethren over to satan, as unfit for you either to speak, eat, drink, or sleep with. Are you willing,

Sir, to be accounted members of those who are thus, by your own canons, under the devil's infer-

nal dominion? Surely you are not!

Well, for your further security, I shall be so kind to you, as to make it yet more evident that you neither are part, nor members of any one of them all; so that, send them to the devil as fast as you can, you shall never have cause to fear their dragging you after them as part of their body: and this my promise you ought to receive as a kindness. The way I shall do it is, by shewing you from the tenets you and other churches hold in contradiction to each other.

CHAP. VIII.

THE PROTESTANT CHURCH OF ENGLAND HOLDS COM-MUNION IN FAITH WITH NO OTHER CHURCH IN THE WHOLE WORLD.

WHEN first you began this pretence of being united to other churches by the bond of faith, you seemed desirous that I should take the trouble to examine whether it was so or not, telling me that "the spiritual union being invisible, I could not possibly know it but by examining your faith." To this, I think, I answered, that your faith was also invisible, and that you ought to let me know it, before I could examine it. But I need not now give you this trouble, for I have since reflected, that it was made visible in the reign of king Edward the 6th. under forty-two heads. In Queen Elizabeth's reign, anno 1562, it became more visible under the thirty-nine articles; but, not yet clear enough it was in the year 1571

polished over again, and subscribed to by Matthew Parker, and half a score like himself, and called thirty-eight articles; the manuscript of which is to be found in Corpus Christi College. In King James the First's reign, anno 1604, it was again exposed with thirty-nine heads, under the form which it now bears, and entitled, the thirty-nine articles.

Since that time, namely, in the year 1607, it was exalted to its meridian of visibility by one Thomas Rogers, poor chaplain, as he styles himself, to the archbishop of Canterbury, to whom he dedicated his book, and who, in behalf of the church of England, it is likely, employed the said chaplain Rogers to explain the said articles. This book of the poor chaplain being finished, the archbishop accepted it, and the whole charch of England approved and authorized it for orthodox, in these words, "Perused, and by the lawful authority of the church of England allowed to be public." This book was reprinted in the year 1629, and again in 1681, and is published under the title of "The faith, doctrine and religion professed and protected in the realm of England, and dominions of the same: explained in thirtynine articles, unanimously agreed upon by the reverend bishops and clergy of this kingdom at two (he might have said four) several of their meetings and convocations in the years of our Lord 1562, and 1604." Now, this faith of yours I shall compare with that of other churches: if any agree with it, you shall be joined in communion with them, not otherwise. To begin with the Greek, and those provinces which agree with her in faith, as Macedon, Epirus, Bulgaria, Circassia, Thrace, Servia, Russia, Moldavia, Wallachia, Bosnia, Vodalia, Mingrelia, Natolia and the Egean Islands, to which may be added, the Russian and Muscovian churches, as also the Patriarchates of

Jerusalem, Antioch, and Alexandria, all which hold several points of faith agreeable to the Roman catholic church, as the real presence, the holy sacrifice of the mass, adoration of the sacred eucharist, prayer to saints, prayers for the dead &c.: all which points are contradicted by your new creed, in its twenty-second, twentyeighth, and thirty-first articles. Besides this, they deny a point of faith held by the Roman church, and yours of England, which is the procession of the Holy Ghost, holding that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father alone, and not from the Son; and, for this reason, Rogers, upon your articles, places the Greeks under his title of errors, and adversaries to truth. They are also condemned for this error by the Roman catholic church, and are also contrary to your first, second, and fifth articles. See Alex. Ross and Rogers upon the first and second articles.

The Armenians hold a coalition of Christ's two natures into one compounded nature, contrary to your eighth article, which authorises the Athanasian creed. They deny, also, the procession of the Holy Ghost, as the Greeks do, contrary to your said first, second, and eigth articles.

See more in Ross and Rogers.

The Nestorians in Asia hold, that Christ became God by merit, but that he was not God by nature. They denied the two natures of Christ to be otherwise united, than, as one friend is joined to another, in good will and affection, contrary to the second and eighth articles, for both which they are condemned in your church by Rogers.

The Eutychians and Dioscorians, of whose opinion are the Egyptians and Abyssinians in Africa, and many others in Asia, affirmed the divinity and humanity of Christ to be of one and the same nature, contrary to your second article, in which

they are also condemned by your church in

Rogers.

The Melchites and Georgians in Asia are of the same religion with the Greeks, though not under their jurisdiction, so that you can pretend to no communion with them for the reasons above.

The Jacobites, in other parts of Asia, hold with the Dioscorians and are also Monothelites, holding but one will in Christ, contrary to your second article: they hold also that angels are made of fire and light, and that the souls of the just remain in the earth, till the resurrection. See Ross.

The Indians, called the Christians of St. Thomas, fell into the Nestorian heresy, but are now reunited to the catholic church, and are in communion with its chief bishop the pope of Rome, Peter's successor.

So likewise many others, through all parts of Asia and the aforesaid Greek provinces, have renounced the Arian, Nestorian, Eutychian, Jacobin and Armenian heresies, and reunited themselves to the holy eatholic church, and its chief pastor and universal head on earth, the bishop of Rome. Nay, even those, who yet remain of them in the above said heresies, do nevertheless retain agreat many points of eatholic faith, as the real presence, sacrifice of the mass, images and prayers to saints, with other points contrary to your twenty-second, twenty-eighth and thirty-first articles. In testimony of what has hitherto been said of them, see Baronius, Proteolus, Gaulterus, Alex. Ross, and Mr. Rogers.

Neither is your protestant church of England of the same faith and communion with any other protestant church or congregation in the whole

bounds of the protestant reformation.

Martin Luther and his followers taught, that the epistle to the Hebrews, that of St. James, the se-

cond of St. Peter, the two last of St. John and the Apocalypse or Revelations were not canonical scripture, contrary both to the catholic church and to your own sixth article: and Rogers cannot produce so much as one Lutheran church in the world that holds all the new testament for canonical. This disagreement between foreign protestants and the church of England so baffled and confounded Rogers, that he was forced to write of the book of the new testament thus. "Although some of the ancient fathers and doctors accepted not all the books contained within the volume of the new testament, for canonical, yet, in the end, they were wholly taken and received by the common consent of the church of Christ in this world for the word. of God." And for this he cites in his margin only the council of Trent, (concil: Trident: Sess. 4, decr: de can: scrip;) where one would have thought that he, by saying "they were received by the common consent of the church of Christ" &c. had designed to have cited all the protestant churches in Germany. But, glory be to God, he was here, in despite of malice itself, forced to put down in this place only the Roman catholic church (as represented in the council (of Trent) or else, he had found no church of Christ at all; for not one protestant church in the world could be get to stand for the church of Christ in this place. However, to colour the matter before his ignorant readers, so as to make them suppose that some of the new gospellers or protestant professors held the same, and so might be supposed the church of Christ that held the same, he, after his way of cunning, goes on thus; "as they are at this day in almost all places where the gospel (meaning protestancy) is preached or professed." But for evidencing this his, "almost in all places," he brings not so much as one protestant church, preacher or professor in the whole world.

I have a remark or two more upon this sentence in Rogers. First, he owning that "some of the ancient fathers accepted not all the books now in the new testament," and the sixth article itself professing to admit no more into the number of canonical books of the new testament, but only such as have never been doubted of in the church, it follows, that, by the article, you are obliged to reject out of the canon such books of the new testament as have been doubted of: and, on the other hand, he owning, and truly too, that at last such as had by the fathers been doubted of were received in the church of Christ, obliges you to take them into your canon, as indeed you do, as canonical books. Thus by your church in the article you are bound by a point of faith to reject them; and, on the contrary, by your church's explanation of it in Rogers you are bound to receive them; that is, you are obliged to believe them canonical, and to believe them not canonical. Who but protestants can believe a plain contradiction? Consider this, Sir, and observe the dilemma you are entangled in. You must either renounce your church's sixth article, in this point, for pretending to receive none but such as have never been doubted of, or else, you must with the Lutherans cast out of your present volume the books of the Hebrews, James, the second epistle of St. Peter, the two last epistles of St. John, and the Revelations: for these have all been formerly doubted of in the church by some or other of the ancient fathers, as well as by the Lutherans.

The second remark. When your English pretended reformers made the articles, they were either ignorant of what books of the new testament had formerly been doubted of: or else, they were mad, making their canon of scripture contain such books, as they, at that very same time, made it an article of faith to deny for canonical, or else, in

short, they were maliciously bent to damn their followers, by putting them under the necessity of denying either this article of their faith, or of denying such books of canonical scripture as the church of Christ received, or, to speak it otherwise, of believing and disbelieving the same thing at the same time. This shews you, also, how little certainty you have of the truth of your article, or of your canon, as relying for it only upon your reformers'

authority.

The last thing I remark is, that the church of England, by Rogers citing only the council of Trent for a proof that the church of Christ receives all the said book for canonical, owns thereby; first, that the council of Trent is the representative of the church of Christ; secondly, that the church of Rome of whose bishops and doctors the council of Trent was composed, is the church of Christ: and thirdly, that what books of the new testament the said council decreed to have been canonical, ought to be, and are, by the church of England upon that council's authority, recorded for canonical; consequently, the church of England is, by the same reason, obliged to receive all such books of the old testament for canonical (by her now rejected for apocryphal) as the church of Christ in the said council of Trent receives and delivers for canonical. But, owning those of the new testament and not those of the old testament, she brings herself under this dilemma, either of holding too few in the old testament, or too many in the new, either of which renders her present canon of scripture not right. More might be said here, but I shall defer it till I have time to examine your section of scripture and so, leaving the digression, I return.

All the Lutheran churches hold the doctrine of consubstantiation, as your church in Rogers owns in the errors upon the twenty-ninth article, saying

that "the Lutheran ubiquitarians say, that the true and real body of Christ is in, with, under the bread and wine, and may be eaten, chewed, and digested even by Turks who never were of the church. And, upon the twenty-sixth article, Rogers tells us over again the Lutheran faith in these words. "The ubiquitarians think the body of Christ is so present in the supper, as his said body with bread and wine, by one and the same mouth at one and the same time of all and every communicant, is eaten corporally and received into the belly." Thus Rogers speaks of the Lutherans; and the Lutheran churches in Germany declared the same to be their doctrine in their Confession of Faith, printed four several times at Augsburg in Germany. But this faith of theirs is contrary to yours of the church of England in your twenty-eight and twenty-ninth articles. And your church in Rogers condemns it for erroneous, and the Lutherans as adversaries to truth.

On the other hand, the Lutherans are resolved to be even with you. For, under the name of sacramentarians, they condemn you and all such as deny their tenet of consubstantiation, as you may see in their writings. Luther himself. in Thes. 27 contr. Artic. Lovan. says, "the Zuinglians and all other sacramentarians are heretics. and alienated from the church of God, who deny the body and blood of Christ to be received with our corporal mouths in the blessed sacrament." John Schutz says, "the doctrine of the sacramentarians is a certain sink into which many heresies flow: it is the very wrath of satan which he, exagitated by furies, exercises against Christ and his church." See Brerely, and The sufeguard from shipwreck. Thus, Sir, the Lutherans deal with you, so that, you must not expect any community with them, or they with you. And of those are the Augsburgian, Saxonian, Brandenburgian, Swedish, Danish, and other Lutheran churches in

Germany.

With John Calvin and his mighty spawn of Genevians, Helvetians, Huguenots, puritans and presbyterians you agree not, but differ in faith. Calvin taught that the Son of God received not his essence from the Father, nor is he God of God, contrary to your second and eighth articles. In his Institutions lib: 3, and ad cap. 9, ep: Rom: he says, that "the wicked have purposely been created that they may be damned." Zuinglius, Beza, and Bucer held the same, and all of them make God the author of sin. See their lives in Brerely; see also Cocsius and Alex. Ross, where you will find more of their blasphemies, as these of Calvin, that "Christ was in the state of the damned when he suffered for us;" and that "he descended not into hell, but suffered the pains of hell upon the cross, and suffered in soul the horrible torments of a damned and wicked man: he was in great horror with the feelings of eternal damnation, and strove with the horrors of eternal damnation." See also his harmony in Mat. 26 and 27: and Institute lib 2. You may find also in Rogers the several presbyterian catechisms and other books cited, which teach the horrible blasphemies. Rogers, upon your article of Christ's descent into hell, places such puritan calvinistic doctrines under his title of errors.

Rogers also condemns the disciplinarian puritans for holding that "baptism administered by unpreaching ministers is not lawful." Prop. 3,

on the twenty-seventh article.

The puritans or presbyterians teach, that "except God work miracuously, the bare reading of scripture, without preaching, cannot deliver so much as one poor soul from destruction." They teach that "either God hath no ehurch in England or that puritans are the church." "The bishops," say they, "declare war against Christ and his

church, and we must bid defiance to them till they yield." Thus Rogers sets down their doctrines and condemns them for it in his propositions upon the nineteenth article and in other places. What likelihood then is there of union, Mr. Ritschel?

But here follows greater difference yet. "The bishops," say they, "of your church have not an ordinary calling from God: they are not ministers of Jesus Christ, by whom he will advance his gospel. Inferior ministers are not, according to God's word, either proved, elected, called, or ordained." "Hence the church of England," say they, "wanteth her pastors and teachers." "Hence they urge," says Rogers, "divers before ordained to seek at their classes a new approbation, which they term the Lord's ordinance, and to take new callings from classical ministers, renouncing their calling from bishops." Thus writes Rogers, for which he condemns them upon the thirty-sixth article.

Thus the Calvinistic crew, and indeed all other protestant churches in the whole pack of reformation, deny episcopacy to be of divine right, nor can the church of England in Rogers bring so much as one protestant in defence of her thirty-

sixth article.

On the other side, when it happens that any of the ministers of any other reformed protestant church come over into yours of England, you will not admit them till they be first ordained anew by your bishops: whence it is evident, you look upon all other protestant churches to have had neither lawful preaching, nor true sacraments (for want of priesthood) since they left the church of Rome by their pretended reformations. Of this dealing of yours, in reordaining of them, they lamentably complain in a letter of theirs directed to your pretended bishops of the church of England in these following words.—" If episcopaey," say the French Huguenots, "is of divine right, it follows, that nei-

ther the protestant churches in France, northose of of Holland, nor those of Germany, nor those of Switzerland, nor Geneva &c. have truly had either ministers or sacraments since the reformation. And would you, my Lords, shut up the ministry of the gospel, and the sacraments of Jesus Christ, in the church of England only; and so look upon the other reformed churches without ministers and sacraments? If you renounce this opinion, that episcopacy is of divine right, you must at the same time revoke the custom of re-ordination. which is but a dependency on it. You cannot imagine how many good souls find themselves scandalized at this custom. That has been chiefly a very great trouble to French ministers, who are dispersed every where, to be obliged to receive a second ordination from your hands, before they are able to execute their office in the church of England &c. My Lords, we have so earnest a desire for peace and union in your church, that it makes us pass beyond the limits that we should inviolably observe on any other occasion but this." Thus these French protestants. You may find their letter in a book entitled; Several letters written by some French protestants concerning the unity of the church. They were published soon after King William's coming to the crown. It is the fifth letter in that book.

Consider all these things well, Sir, and then tell me, what pretence you can have to union in faith or government with other protestant churches, or they with yours? Mind well, Sir, that the principle of episcopacy's being of divine right, and your practice of ordaining their ministers anew, unchurches all those pretended churches. Their contrary principle, and their practice of reordaining your ministers likewise unchurches your pretended church of England, contrary to your first, second, fifth and eight articles.

The anabaptists assert that Christ is not true God, that he took not flesh of the Virgin Mary, contrary to your second article. They deny infant baptism, and rebaptize, contrary to your twenty-seventh article. They believe we are to enjoy an earthly paradise after the day of judgment.

The millenarians are of this opinion: only they

hold it to last but one thousand years.

The Adamites are also a sort of anabaptists: they pray naked, and call that posture the state of innocency.

The sabbatarians are another branch of them,

who keep the Jewish sabbath.

The antisabbatarians are for keeping no sabbath at all. These are also another sort of imps out of the same stock.—You may see more of them in Alex. Ross, if you please there to read the lives of Nicholas Stork, Montzerus, John of Leyden, Knipperdolling, John Matthias, Herman the cobler, Theodore the butcher, David George and others, their first beginners, and then tell me if

yours and their doctrines agree.

The antinomians are another sort of protestants that reject the ten commandments, and will not have God's law to be preached, nor the consciences of sinners to be terrified and troubled with the judgments of God.—Rogers condemns this in Ibbius, but will not name Luther, though he knew very well this apostate was the first broacher of the antinomian heresy. It is a dependency of the doctrine that faith alone justifies. "The greatest art and christian wisdom," says this impious Luther, "is not to know the law, to be ignorant of good works and all active justice." Se argum: in ep: ad Galat: edit: prim: "There are so many testimonies of scripture which prove the commandments of God impossible to be kept, as there is nothing more manifest. Thou dost most wickedly

in saying that our Saviour has not commanded impossiblities, yea, thou dost more than most wickedly in daring to call it an untruth, to say, we cannot fulfil the commandments in this life."

Though your seventh article is contradictory to this antinomian tenet, yet your article, that faith alone justifies, includes it. Your Practice of Piety also asserts, that "we are justified before God by faith only without good works;" and teaches further, that "no man in this life, since the fall of Adam, can perfectly fulfil the commandments of God." See the impression of it printed in 1643 page 513, 515. Though your church side with them in the eleventh article, yet the seventh disagreeing with them, hinders you from piecing. And if it so happened, that you and they could agree in this; (as I will not say but you may) yet differing in other points, (expressed above under Luther and Calvin) you would be but still where you are, far from uniting.

The independents, with which sort New England, and most of our other English plantations in the West Indies agree, hold, that their own revelations are of equal authority with the scriptures; and this would ruin your adequate rule. They tell you further, that no man ought to be troubled in conscience for sin; this doctrine I think, you may digest, because it is a consequence of your eleventh article. But they go further, and must have you believe, that, "the soul dieth with the body, that Christ's humanity is not in heaven." This last you cannot do without contradicting your fourth article. See

Ross.

The quakers, which are the very excrements of the anabaptists, and one of the most antichristian sects amongst protestants, hold whatsoever their enthusiastic devil—their private spirit, suggests. Some deny the unity: others hold that Christ has

no other body but his church, and that his coming in the flesh is but a figure; others that there is no resurrection, but only a rising from sin. Some affirm themselves to be God; others say they are Christ: all of them cry up a light within them sufficient to direct them; and every one of them follows the illumination of that hellish light, though it has often led them into the strongest madnesses that have ever been heard of; for example, preaching naked in public marketplaces, heating their ovens and closing them up without putting any thing in them, upon a foolish conceit, that, by their faith they, should find them presently full of baked bread, pies and puddings: sometimes thrusting their hands into the hot fire, believing that it would not have power to burn them. Sometimes they will fall a trembling and quaking, and foaming at the mouth, casting themselves upon the ground, and so agitated, as if actually possessed by the devil; and it is very likely they are; yet all this they will have to be the effects of their spirits and light within them. By this spirit they frequently pretend to prophecy, but never speaking any other but lies and non-sense. In a word, whatsoever else they hold, they all unanimously deny baptism with water, accounting it antichristian. Your first, second, and twenty-seventh articles are contrary to several of their doctrines.

Now, Sir, according to your motion, I have examined your faith, and compared your new creed, the thirty-nine articles, with the doctrine of all those churches or congregations of which you would so gladly have been accounted members. And, you see, not one of them all agrees with you in faith: neither do you hold the same faith with any of them. If you have the confidence to pretend, hereafter, your church a part or member of any other church or churches, be sure you fail not to let me know, of what church or churches

you are a part, and which, of all those I named above, you will take into this pretended catholic communion, of which you speak. When you have pitched upon which, and how many, then reconcile their faiths and religions together, and all of them with your own. If you cannot do this, let them all alone, and never pretend hereafter to be a

part or member of any of them.

But, methinks I see you grieve heavily, to be thus separated from all those protestant churches which Mr. Rogers so often styles "your godly brethren, the people of God, the churches of God, the saints, the churches reformed after the word of God, the churches militant and reformed, the churches godly reformed, the protestant churches" &c.: But grieve not, dear Sir; stop those torrents of tears; you have not so great a cause for mourning as you imagine: perhaps, if you had set yourself to work for a good turn, there could not a better have been done you, than this separating you from so many monsters. If I had let you run on in your heedless career and perilous pretence of being part of them, as sure as death, they would eat you up alive, and devour that small morsel of christianity your pretended reformation has left you, if it is any at all. For this is most certain, that, while you own your thirty-nine articles for a true confession of faith, you must, of necessity, hold every one of the said churches, whether protestant or other, for hereties: because, not one of them all but hold points of faith contrary to some or other of your thirtynine articles, as I have shewn you. And can you think it such a happiness to be a part or member of heretical congregations?

But, here is another affliction to you, and horribly disturbs your peace of mind. It is the apprehension of being left alone, without the possibility of being a part or member of any other church: which is, in short, to make you no church at all: for the whole catholic church you have already declared you are not; a part or member of the church of Rome you have also often enough disowned your church to be; and a part or member of any other church or congregation you cannot be, for the reasons above. So that, being neither the whole, nor a part or member of the whole, or of any other in the universe, what shall we take you for, but a cipher or no church?

Believe me, Sir, I foresaw that it would come to this, when I found you denying your church to be the *catholic church*, and only contenting yourself to take up with the *unlucky* pretence of being only a member or part of it. I then lamented your case, and you see now it was not without reason.

Though to pretend yours the catholic church is nonsense in the highest degree, yet, in one respect, you had better have stuck closely to it. For, by so doing, you might still have had a pretence of requiring your pretended godly brethren, saints, godly reformed &c. to have sought to you for admission into your catholic church; whereas, by thus declaring yourselves only a part or bare member, you oblige yourselves to go cringing on all fours to them, to be taken in as such; and, the worst mischief is, you know not to which of them all to apply yourselves, they being so divided from one another, and in such mortal hatred with one another, that, if any of them should receive you for a part, all the rest would reject both it and you. Moreover, your pretended church has so shackled the hands and feet of her followers with articles and excommunications, that, if any of them were willing to embrace and entertain you, you cannot possibly move either finger or toe towards them, unless you first resolve to break all the ligaments in the whole body of the church of

England.

After all this you and your church may still become happy if you please, and may justly be accounted a part of the holy catholic church; but you must take the right way for it, which is only this. In the first place, you must leave all manner of pretence to partnership with all the above said heretical and schismatical congregations; secondly, you must renounce all your above said new articles with whatever else you hold contrary to the faith, worship, and government of the catholic church, the church of Rome; and lastly, you must with humble submission embrace the faith, worship and government of the church of Rome, and the successor of St. Peter, its head. By this means you may again be reunited and made a part of the one, holy, catholic and apostolic church, as you were before the pretended reformation. If you will not do this, you must remain as you are, a schismatical and heretical congregation, cut off and divided from the holy catholic church.

I have yet to consider your reply to a certain demand made by me in my answer to your first letter. And then I hope we shall come to a conclusion of this tiresome point of your being part or member of any other body. The question is

this.

CHAP. IX.

WHERE WAS THE TRUE CHURCH OF GOD, AT THE TIME WHEN YOU BEGAN YOUR PRETENDED REFORMATION? AND WHAT PUBLIC PROFESSORS HAD SHE HOLDING AND TEACHING THE TRUE FAITH?

To this, in your book, page 139, you reply thus: "And what, if I should also demand the like of you, concerning the church of God, under king Ahab, when the prophet Elijah made this sad complaint, I, even I only, am left," &c.: It was not necessary, in this place, to have demanded what was already asked, and as kindly by yourself answered at the same time, as I have shewn you above, so that I need say nothing more to it here. Only, I must put you in mind of a little mean protestant slight in bringing in the prophet complaining I, even I, am left alone, and then cutting off with an "&c." no fewer than seven thousand men that stood as firm as himself. This is done on purpose, that your protestant readers might think the prophet only, and no more of the whole church of God was left standing at that time.

"But, God be thanked," say you, "the case was not so ill with the church of God before the reformation, the gospel was preached in every nation under heaven." You have spoken a great truth in this sentence, and I pray God you may

rightly consider it.

At the time immediately preceding the reformation, the gospel was preached in every nation under heaven. This great truth you fairly grant, and positively assert. Tell me, then, what need had you to reform? Could you not be content to

follow the gospel that was preached in every nation under heaven? And, was it not enough for you to keep yourself in union with those who then preached and professed it? Was not this sufficient for Luther, but he must separate himself from all the preachers and professors of the gospel then preached in every nation, and preach up and propose to the world such a gospel of his own, as not one nation under heaven, at that time,

knew any thing of?

The gospel was preached in every nation under heaven; this you affirm, and it is true, I say.— Tell me then, Mr. Ritschel, is it the gospel of Christ you mean, or the gospel of antichrist? If the gospel of antichrist, then where was the truc church of God, and what benefit could it receive by such preaching? If the gospel of Christ was then preached in every nation under heaven, it therefore follows (as I suppose it is Christ's gospel you speak of, because you thank God for it) that the pretence of Luther, Calvin and Cranmer to reform was nonsense and vain, yea, a bold and most presumptuous impiety; for, who is he that can mend what Christ has made? and who he that dare pretend to reform what Christ the son of God has formed?

Seeing the gospel of Christ was then preached in every nation under heaven, it therefore follows, that it was preached in Germany, France, Spain, Italy, England, Scotland, Ireland &c.; but, at that time, there was no other gospel preached in the said nations but the same that was then preached in the Roman catholic church, and by Roman catholic preachers. It therefore follows, that the gospel, then preached in the church of Rome, and by Roman catholic preachers, was the gospel of Christ: and, that the said nations of France, Spain, England, &c. had then the gospel of Christ preached in them. If you deny this gospel

of Christ to have been then preached in these nations by Roman catholics, tell me, then, what other sort of preachers they were that taught it, and of what church, and why your pretended reformers did not follow their preaching, and join in communion with them?

It is most certain that this sentence of yours, if rightly understood and applied to the preachers of the catholic church, and the gospel by them taught, is as true a saying as ever came from your lips: for, it is undeniable that, when your new gospellers, Luther, Calvin, &c. began, the Roman catholic faith was not only spread over all the above named nations, but also by Roman catholic missionaries preached and taught among the Greek churches and other schismatical and heretical churches, through all Asia, using incessant endeayours to reclaim them from their errors, nay, even among heathens and infidels both in America, Africa, and the East Indies, and no other but only this faith of the Roman catholic church was ever so universally preached either at that time, or ever before or since. So that, your grant and affirmation of the gospel of Christ being then preached in every nation under heaven cannot be true, unless understood and meant of the Roman catholic faith, and the gospel preached by the preachers and missionaries of the Roman catholic church only, and by no others: so that, your sentence is an excellent proof of the church of Rome's being the true church of God, and its faith the gospel of Christ.

I believe that, when you wrote this, you designed thereby to insinuate into the heads of your protestant readers, that there were protestants before Luther, and at the time when he began, who preached the protestant gospel in every nation under heaven. If this is what you would be at, tell me then what protestant gospellers preach-

ed it in France, who in Spain, who in Italy, who in England, who in Scotland &c. in the year 1516 which was the very year before Luther began? If you cannot do this, never think that your protestant readers will be so imprudent as to swallow the gudgeon. The world knows that there neither was protestant gospel, nor protestant preach-

ers before Luther.

"The church of God was in so good a state, when Luther began, that the gospel of Christ was preached in every nation under heaven:" this you "But," says your homily, "the whole christendom, yea, the whole world was, for above eight hundred years together, before Luther, drowned in damnable idolatry, to the destruction of all good religion universally." Pray, Mr. Ritschel, let these two be reconciled. Go on now with the rest of your sentence. "And there were then many other churches besides the church of Rome, though not free from many errors and corruptions and which stood in need of a reformation." And is this all you come off with. It is not erroneous and corrupt churches, or gospellers that I enquire after. What I here demand is, who they were that preached Christ's gospel in every nation under heaven, when Luther began? A gospel that is erroneous and corrupt is not the gospel of Christ; for his is always true and incorrupt, and must of necessity be so, because he is God, and has promised it. His gospel, therefore, needs no mending or reformation. It is such a church and such a gospel as this you must produce, if you will shew us the true church and gospel of Christ. Go on then. "I wonder that you forgot the Greek church and all those under her jurisdiction, who would never submit to the bishop of Rome."

Why name you the Greek church, when you but just now told us of the many other churches (in which the Greek must needs be included,) which

were erroneous and corrupt? The Greek church being one of those erroneous and corrupt churches, what should she do here, where a true and incorrupt church preaching the gospel of Christ under heaven is sought after? And the great question is, where the true church and its public professors were, before Luther began to reform?

Besides, whether that church submitted, or did not submit to the bishop of Rome, is no part of our enquiry or business in this place. Nor has it any relation to the question in hand, unless you will pretend her nonsubmission, to be an argument of her being the true church of God; which if you do, you may, by the same argument, make the Jew's Synagogue, the Mahometans, and William Penn's unchristened kirk in Pensylvania, the true church of God, and preachers of Christ's gospel, in every nation under heaven. It is but saying, they would never submit to the bishop of Rome, and the conclusion will as naturally follow for them as for the Greeks.

But you mistake yourself, Mr. Ritschel, when you say that the Greek church would never submit to the bishop of Rome. If you had been a little better skilled in ecclesiastical history and councils of the church, you would have known the contrary to this; you would have found no less than seven or eight general councils all held in Greece, four of them at Constantinople itself, the last of these in the year 869, all owning the bishop of Rome's supremacy, not one of them either denving it, nor so much as once questioning it. did they fall off from their submission to the pope, till the time that the schismatic Photius usurped the patriarchal see of Constantinople, which was not till near nine hundred years after Christ. that you impose upon us in saying the Greek church would never submit to the bishop of Rome. But I will judge as favourable as I can, and impute

this to your want of skill in history, for you are

no Baronius, Mr. Ritschel.

But if your assertion were true, as you see it is not, yet, considering the Greek church holds all or most of those points of faith which you condemn in the Roman church for idolatry, superstitious, and antichristian, you can no more take her for the true church of God, (standing to your thirty-nine articles) than you can the church of Rome. Besides, the Greek church detracting from the dignity of the Son and denying the procession of the Holy Ghost, how can either you or we take her for a church that preaches the gospel of Christ? Nor did the Greek church preach this their gospel against the procession of the Holy Ghost in every nation under heaven, at the time Luther began. If I should call upon you for a Greek gospeller preaching the Grecian faith, either in France, Spain, Germany, Italy, England, or the East or West Indies, when your pretended reformation began, vou could not find his name either in your vast, capacious memory or in all the books of your library. So that the Greek church must not be set up for the true church of God preaching the gospel of Christ in every nation under heaven.

But tell me, Sir, if the Greek church was then the true church of God, why did not Luther, Calvin, Cranmer, Parker and the rest of your pretended reformers unite themselves in faith, worship and government with her? Perhaps you may answer me (and with truth) that the German protestants did move the Greeks for being taken into their communion. And this I grant. And I really believe, if they had effected it, the English protestants would have followed their example. But the mischief of it was, the sage Greeks would not admit any of you into communion. They foresaw you would no sooner be entered the gates of the eastern church, but you would be turning all

things upside down by your reforming. The English sort of protestants they knew well would be for obliging them to swear the temporal prince head of their church, and the Greek patriarch and his bishops can never endure your telling them they must take the oath of supremacy to the Grand Turk.

If you will permit me to offer you a word of advice, return again into the church of Rome, the catholic church, and never set up the Greek church for the true church of God; nor beg of those sullen people for admittance into communion, or, for taking you in for part or members of them: for, as sure as you live, they will reject you as they did the German protestants your godly reformed brethren, and that disdainfully enough too, though they begged with all the cringing and insinuating expressions imaginable, directing their letters thus "To the most holy and canonical Patriarch, the lord Jeremy, archbishop of Constantinople, a pious lord": and, in another of their epistles they put down, instead of pious lord, "our most reverend lord," using abundance of the like coaxing expressions in their letters as, "vouchsafing us pardon, and receiving us favourably into thy fatherly care," concluding with, " farewell, most holy lord." The patriarch, tired with their importunities, sent them at last this positive answer.

"We were determined to be altogether silent to those your demands, neither to give you any answer, who so plainly alter at your pleasure both the scriptures and interpretations of holy doctors, seeing, we are exhorted by St. Paul, to reject an heretical man, after two or three admonitions. We are fully assured, by your writings, that you can never agree with us, or rather, with the truth; and, therefore, we desire you hereafter not to be troublesome to us, &c.: for the

divines, who were the light of the church, you treat in different manners; in words you honour them, but in deeds you reject them, &c. In so much, therefore, as concerns you, you have freed us from cares."

All their articles (except that of the pope's supremacy wherein they opposed the faith of the Roman church) he rejected for novelties and errors in faith, and contrary to the universal and apostolical traditions. Thus disgracefully your fellow-protestants were repulsed by the Greek patriarch. The letters that passed between them are to be seen in Acta Theologorum Wittembergensium, Jerimiæ, Patriarchæ Constantinopolitani de Augustana Confessione, printed at Wittemberg, anno 1584. Nor did it happen much better to Dr. Cousins, late bishop of Durham, who, in his banishment with king Charles the Second, being at Paris had the good fortune fo meet a Grecian bishop, named Cyril, archbishop of Trapezond. The doctor, glad of this opportunity, resolved to try, if happily he might prevail with the Greek church, by means of this archbishop, to take the poor, silly, banished church of England into her motherly lap. And, to this intent, he translated into Greek, the common prayer, and thirty-nine articles of the church of England, which he presented in a very humble manner to the Grecian archbishop, but without success. For, as soon the Greek and his learned companion, a monk of St. Basil's order, had perused and well considered the same, they disdainfully rejected both common prayer and confession of faith, the thirty-nine articles, as things strange to them, new, and heretical, and contrary to the faith and worship of the Greek church. See Fiat Lux.

The Greek church, moreover, holds the real presence, sacrifice of the mass, adoration of the blessed sacrament, prayer for the dead, prayer to

the saints, images, &c. all which you condemn. And they also condemn you for denying them; so that, here is cold entertainment for you among the Greeks.

Though you were so exceedingly astonished that I had forgot the Greek church, when I asked you for protestant professors, yet, you see, when I have remembered it, it turns nothing to your advantage, more than to shew you of what you were ignorant before, namely, that it condemns both German and English protestants for heretics.

You need not to have put me to all this trouble, Sir, if you had considered that the question between us is not about what schismatical and heretical churches were in the east, when you began to form protestancy. For the query is, were the true church of God was, and what public professors it had at that time? What do you say to this, Sir? "There wanted not before that time, even within that usurped jurisdiction of the bishop of Rome, those who made complaint, and did protest against your errors and corruptions, as Peter Waldo of Lyons, about the year 1160." I tell you, Sir, that our question is what professors were living at the time when you began, and not about your half protestants (as you call them) that lived four hundred years before. But, however, seeing you have brought this broken merchant, Peter Waldo, upon the stage, we will see what kind of a figure he makes before he goes off. What do you say of him, in the first place?

"He, being persuaded to reform his life, upon a due sense of mortality, translated some books of the bible, and instructed such as resorted to him in the way of godliness, teaching withal, that purgatory, masses, worshiping of saints, and prayers for the dead, were the invention of the devil, and snares of avarice; reproving severely

the vicious lives of your clergy," &c. And, here you cut off, and craftily conceal all the rest of his detestable doctrines with an "&c.," on purpose to hide them from the knowledge of those unlearned readers to whom you sent copies of your letter. Thus you palm Waldo upon them for an admirable professor of half-protestancy. But, seeing you cannot deal candidly yourself, pray give your brother of the gown, Alexander Ross, of whom you ought to learn sincerity, liberty to tell us the rest of the horrid tenets this heretic held.

In the first place, he takes him for a heretic, ranking him among the heretics of the twelfth century; then, he adds to what you have said already, that "the Waldenses (Peter and his crew) held, that laymen might preach, and consecrate the bread." (This would take the office over your head, parson!) "They rejected all prayers except the Lord's prayer": (what would have become of your common prayer book, among them?) they held that the eucharist, consecrated on Friday, had more efficacy than on any other day: they rejected the distinction of bishop and priest": (this would vex your pretended bishops to the heart, but, would please several of your parsons, as Mr. Rudderford, your neighbour, whom I have heard affirm, that "bishops are not necessary for the ordaining of priests, but, that a priest may ordain in absence of the bishop.") "They held that priests falling into sin lost their power in consecrating"; (how many powerful parsons would you have at this rate!) "They held that magistrates and governors, if they fall into sin, lose their authority"; (brave plea for rebels!) "They taught that no man ought to suffer death by the sentence of any judge"; (brave encouragement for thieves, murderers, traitors and other malefactors!) "They rejected

the apostles' creed:" (excellent half-protestants!) "they held it unlawful for clergy to possess temporalities": (this would go mightily against the grain with your brother parsons and their wives) but, to make amends in another kind to both, they permit promiscuous copulation." These, Sir, were the Waldensians' doctrines, and vast numbers of libertines, malefactors, traitors, rebels, and wicked rabble followed, and flocked in from all sides; so that Waldo began to wax great suddenly, insomuch that the adjoining princes

thought it time to look about them. With this beastly offspring of Waldo joined the Albigenses, another sect of heretics of that age, vet had their origin from that Waldo, as Dr. Henry More signifies in his exposition of the seven epistles to the seven churches, saying, "the Albigenses and Waldenses are both one sect, and from one author, Waldo of Lyons," page 57.—Alex. Ross says, "these Albigenses held two Gods, that our bodies were made by satan, that the scriptures were erroneous, all oaths unlawful, baptism unnecessary, rejected the old testament, prayer in the church, and denied marriage, held there were two Christs, a good born in an unknown land, a bad in Judea; they taught God had two wives, of whom he begot sons and daughters," with other abominable blasphemies, as you may see in Alex. Ross.

Now, Sir, if you had ingenuously given us an account of all this, as you ought to have done, we should have seen no great reason for your so hugging yourself as you do, (p. 140.) in contemplation of the vast numbers and great figure (as you say) Waldo's followers made, who were able to raise such mighty armies, as to force pope Innocent the third to translate the war from the holy land against them. On the contrary, it would have appeared what just cause there was for his so

turning war upon them: and happy it was for the neighbouring princes he did so, for, as Du Haillan, the French historian reports, "there were above a hundred thousand men of them gathered into arms under their leader count Ramund, earl of Tolouse," and Dr. More, out of Peter Perionius on the Albigensian war, says, that one million of them were slain in several battles. See his book above cited. In a word they were overthrown by Simon earl of Montferrat. See Alex. Ross.

Go on. "Now these half-reformed protestants (though they had not that name) and the purer part of the church of God under the usurpation of

the bishop of Rome:" thus you say p. 147.

Libera nos Domine! if they were but half-protestants, heaven shield us from your whole-protestants. You are like to make God a beautiful building of a church, when the purer part of the fabric is framed of such polished stones as these! In my opinion, you had better never have opened Waldo's Pandorean urn, than to be thus forced to rake among his filthy ashes for such a pack of half-protestant-professors as these. Yet, you have a great mind to wash those blackamoors white, and to this intent you tell us, "the cruel inquisitor Reynerius gives a brave character of them, and for this you cite Fuller's church history, a testimony no better than that of your own, when you say Cochleus and Bolsecus (whom you ignorantly call Dolsecus) aspersed Luther and Calvin, whereas, if you had read Luther and Calvin's lives, written by Brerely from protestant authorities, and their own writings, you might have seen them in blacker colours than either of those writers drew them in. As for Fuller's history and its testimony out of Reynerius, they cannot defend those impious hypocrites against the authentie, credible, and impartial histories of Baronius, Genebrand, Prateolus, Gaulterus, and

others, who testify at large all I have said of them, and much more. So, I say, does your own protestant author, Alexander Ross. What Reynerius speaks of them is only from their demeanour before him, as an inquisitor, where, for fear of punishment, they hypocritically concealed their blasphemous and abominable tenets, and of devils, put on the vizards of angels of light, on purpose to escape the rigorous punishments of the inquisition; it being also one of their tenets to deny and dissemble their religion, when called before authority.

You have also the confidence to tell us, "these Waldensians continued till the time of Luther and Calvin"; which if true, why did you not name some of them in existence at that time? But, this you did not dare to do, for the thing is false. There was not one of them upon the earth at that time! I challenge you to name so much as one of the Waldenses on this side hell at that time when Luther and Calvin began their new

religions.

But, admitting Waldo to have been, not only a half, but a whole protestant, and that some of his litter have lasted till Luther; yet, seeing he was the first broacher of that impious religion, it stands upon the same tenure as to novelty with that of Luther, Calvin, or Cranmer. Your own words also discover Waldo to have been a heretic, and his doctrines new and heretical, when you bring him in denying and contradicting points of faith then held in the church when he began. You had acted the controvertist much more to the purpose, if you had told us of whom Waldo learned his doctrines, and who taught them to Waldo's instructors, &c., till you had deduced them from the apostles. But, this is an impossibility in heretical points. Waldo had no other teacher but the Father of lies, nor mission] but

from that infernal master of his. Priesthood he had none, being only a poor broken merchant of Lyons. And so we will leave him, to see what follows.

"Nor was it Waldo alone," say you, "but St. Bernard, and many others, who complained and protested against the corruptions of the church of Rome." You are, certainly, the most shameless writer that ever handled a pen, to have the impudence to bring in St. Bernard, that great and holy catholic doctor, for a protestant, or half-

protestant professor.

St. Bernard was so far from protesting against, or finding the least fault with, the faith of the church of Rome, that, on the contrary, he always professed it, and lived and died in it, and, after his death, was, by the church and pope of Rome, canonized for a saint, which would never have been done, if he had either denied the pope's supremacy, or protested against any one point of the Roman catholic faith, as you thus maliciously and deceitfully insinuate. Tell me in your next, what points of faith they were he protested against? and what points of protestant new faith he asserted against the church of Rome? If you cannot do this, you must not think I do you any wrong, if I charge you with gross untruth, and accuse you of calumniating the holy St. Bernard, and rank you in the number of impostors, for thus deceiving your ignorant readers, by obtruding upon them such notorious untruths.

What St. Bernard reproved was the bad manners and evil lives of men, not sparing the clergy, bishops, or pope himself, so far as, and where, he saw just occasion, and this is a thing not only laudable, but the duty of every good pastor, priest, bishop and doctor of the church. Nay, do you exclaim against vice and immorality as much a

you please, neither priest, bishop, nor pope will ever find fault with you for this, provided you charge no man unjustly, but keep within the limits of truth. Now, what St. Bernard wrote against immorality and bad manners, you, abounding with heretical malice, would have your readers believe was written against corruptions in faith; (for it is about faith, not manners, we dispute now) whereas it is evident from your bishop Jewel himself, that St. Bernard never opposed the faith of the church of Rome; "St. Bernard," says Jewel in his apology, "was no Lutheran, Bernard was no heretic, he had not forsaken the catholic church."

St. Bernard being most intimate with pope Eugenius, (the pope having formerly been his scholar) wrote freely to him, reproving whatever he saw amiss in manners, either in him or the inferior elergy. But he is so far from speaking against his supremacy, that, on the contrary, in the same epistle he styles him "The great priest, the highest bishop, chief of all bishops, heir of the apostles, for primacy Abel, for government Noah, for patriarchship Abraham, for holy orders Melchizedech, for dignity Aaron, for authority Moses, for judgment Samuel, for power Peter, for anointing Christ. "Thou art he," says he, "to whom the keys were delivered, to whom the sheep were committed. There are also other porters of heaven, and pastors of flocks, but thou so much surpassing all others, as thou hast inherited both names in more different manners: they have their flocks assigned unto them, each man one: all are committed to thee, the one whole flock to one: neither art thou only the pastor of all the sheep, but also the only pastor of the pastors. Again, the authority of others is restrained to certain prescribed bounds, thine is extended even upon those who have received power over others. Thy privilege re-

mains to thee unshaken, as well in the keys which were given thee, as in the sheep that were commended to thee. Again, whereas every other man hath his, to thee is committed the greatest ship of all, made up out of all other ships, to wit, the universal church dispersed through the whole world." Thus wrote that great saint to pope Eugenius, see lib. 2. de consideratione; read his epistle at large, and you will see him prove all that is here said out of holy scripture and undeniable arguments. Never bring in St. Bernard hereafter for a protestant, or one that either taxes the church for corruptions in faith, or opposes the

pope's supremacy.

As you deal with us about St. Bernard, so you do about the princes of Germany, falsely, as to insinuating that the said princes laid before the pope a hundred grievances against faith; "and pope Adrian the sixth," say you, "like an honest man, did ingenuously acknowledge those corruptions, and promised the Germans that they should have a reformation." Thus, Sir, you would make your ignorant reader believe that pope Adrian acknowledged corruptions in matters of faith, and the things he promised a reformation in concerned And, to this intent, you improperly and falsely render the word gravamina, corruptions, which, if rightly englished, as you do above, signifies grievances, not corruptions; for a thing may be a grievance when it is not a corruption. Then, you make use of the word reformation where the word redress should have stood, and thus by corruption and change of words you would make it appear as if pope Adrian acknowledged corruptions in faith and promised a reformation in faith.

That manifesto was written and published by the instigation and device of the Lutheran heretical party; so that, whatever was in it touching any thing of faith must be imputed to the Lutheran spirit, and not to the catholic princes of Germany, who had no hand in it, the whole contrivance being of John Frederick, Duke of Saxony, and his schismatical and heretical adherents; so that, you stand in no need of an answer to the matter in debate, namely, what protestant professors you find before Luther. Nor does pope Adrian's promise to redress such temporal grievances and differences, as might then be between the Germans and the court of Rome, (not relating to faith) make any thing at all for you, this being a thing always done by popes, when princes have just cause of complaint. In short, your cause must needs be desperately bad, when it stands in need of such shifts to defend it.

"And these," you say, "were the reasons which made Luther, and Calvin, and our reformers, forsake the communion of the church of Rome." And, were the "centum gravamina," the reasons then? How bravely you impose upon us, who will have the not redressing the hundred grievances to be the cause of Luther and Calvin forsaking the church of Rome, when the world knows, those two apostles had left the church long before ever the said grievances were written or mentioned. Luther fell from the church in the time of pope Leo the tenth, who was the predecessor of pope Adrian the sixth, to whom, you say, those hundred grievanees were presented; and, yet, you will have the pope's not redressing them, to be the cause why Luther left the church. How finely they will be fit, who rely upon your skill in chronology, Mr. Ritschel!

I have now thoroughly examined all you have said concerning a protestant church, and professors of protestantism, before the pretended reformation. But, not so much as either a church or a single man can be found. Even those churches you pretend to, you dare not be so bold as to take either for protestant, or true churches of God; but, on the contrary, brand them with the notes, crroneous, and corrupt, and such as needed a reformation. And, as for your protestant professors, they come off with a monstrous chimera of half protestants hatched from an egg, laid by Peter Waldo, the beggar of Lyons, in the lap of the beastly rabble.

But, what will you say, Sir, if, after all this, I make it evident from your own sentences in your letters, that, at the time of the pretended reformation, the church of Rome was, and consequently, at this day is, the true church of God—

the holy catholic church?

CHAPTER X.

EVIDENT FROM MR. RITSCHEL'S WRITINGS THAT THE CHURCH OF ROME IS THE TRUE CHURCH OF GOD—THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

THIS universally acknowledged truth (except by schismatics and heretics) has been frequently testified and defended by the holy fathers, in all ages, as may be seen in Baronius, and other eclesiastical histories; as also in Jodocus Coccius, Gaulterus, and others, who have collected testimonies for the same, as, likewise, for its faith and doctrine, in every age, even from the time of the apostles to our days; fer which I refer you to their works; my business, in this place, being to cridence this great truth out of your own writings, Mr. Ritschel. I shall, first, therefore, collect yoursentences out of the several places of your letters, and then shew you their necessary, and undeniable consequences.

In your letter of March 4th, 1787, page 2, you have these words: "there is but one faith or true religion," In page 6 "there is but one faith or true religion, and that both before and since the coming of Christ." The same you repeat again in your book, page 128. In the same book, page 7 and 9, you affirm, that "you hold communion in faith with the true church of God in all ages." And in page 128 and 129 you tell us again, that "you hold communion with the true church of God in all ages." And in page 139, that "you have the same common salvation with the true church of God in all ages." And in page 132 you again affirm that "God has had a true church in all ages." In page 7 you, in a very solemn manner, affirm that "there is but one fuith or true religion, and that God has had a true church in all ages: and this the church of England never denied any more than she denies the being of one true and living God." Thus you write, and from these so often repeated grants, that "God has had a true church holding and believing the one faith or true religion in all ages," it undeniably follows: first, that the true church of God was actually in being and actually holding and believing the one true faith or religion, in that very age, and at that very time, immediately before, and when Luther, Calvin, Cranmer, &c. began their pretended reformation; or else she could not have been in all ages. Secondly, that the church of England held communion with this true church of God in that her one true faith and true religion, in that age and time immediately before her pretended reformation, for otherwise she could not have held communion with it in all ages.

But it needs no evidence to prove, that the church, with which the church of England held communion in faith and religion immediately before and at the pretended reformation, was the

church of Rome, it being evident in all protestant as well as Catholic historians, who have written concerning the reformation, as also in several of your acts of parliament; yea, it is granted by your own self page 142, when you say, that "Luther, Calvin and your reformers forsook the communion of the church of Rome." Therefore the church of Rome, at that very time when you forsook her communion by your pretended reformation, was the very true church of God, the catholic church, and then held and believed the one true faith and true religion, the catholic faith.

Consider here the irresistible and wonderful force of truth. It often discovers itself when he that speaks has the least thoughts of uttering it; yea, when he even designs the contrary. of your own mouth, when least intended, have elapsed so many sentences as bring along with them this great truth that the church of Rome is the true church of God. Out of which truth spring also these others, all as undeniable and certain as First, that, in forsaking the church of Rome, protestants have forsaken the true church of God, the holy catholic church, and therefore protestants are schismatics.

Secondly, in leaving the faith and religion of the church of Rome, protestants have left the true faith and religion of the church of God, the holy catholic faith, and therefore protestants are he-

Thirdly, from these necessarily follows this final conclusion, that the protestant church of England is no part nor member of the catholic church. Witness the writings of George Ritschel, vicar of Hexham.

PART III.



CHAPTER I.

SOME REMARKS UPON CERTAIN PARTICULAR PASSAGES IN YOUR LETTERS WHICH HAVE LITTLE OR NO RELATION TO THE POINT OF YOUR BEING PART OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH. AND FIRST, UPON WHAT YOU WRITE ABOUT THE CONVERSION OF OUR ENGLISH NATION TO CHRISTIANITY: SECONDLY, UPON YOUR CALUMNIES AGAINST ST. AUGUSTINE: AND THIRDLY, UPON THAT EPISTLE FALSELY PRETENDED TO HAVE BEEN SENT FROM POPE ELEUTHERIUS TO KING LUCIUS.

IN my answer to your letter of March the fourth, I told you the church of England held communion with the church and pope of Rome, from the very first conversion of our English nation from heathenism to christianity till the beginning of your pretended reformation: and that, from king Ethelbert, who was the first Saxon or English king (that was christian) till king Henry the eighth, there was not one christian king who did not hold communion with the church and pope of Rome. And that from St. Augustine, who converted this nation and was the first archbishop of Canterbury, till the days of Thomas Cranmer, who was archbishop of Canterbury in the time of king Henry the eighth and king Edward the sixth, there was not one of those archbishops who held that see from the said St. Augustine to the said Thomas Cranmer who did not hold communion with the church and pope of Rome; for all which I gave you sufficient authorities, as may be seen in the said answer.

But you, Mr. Ritschel, would be taken for too well read in English chronology and church history, to own this for truth. "Perhaps it may pass," you say, "with the ignorant, but you cannot expect to impose so far upon any who have read our English chronicles, or know when the gospel was planted in this Island."

You had befter have read my words twice over than thus misunderstand them, for I speak, not of the gospel's first planting in this Island among the Britons, but, what I say is of our English na-

tion, the Saxons.—You proceed thus.

"And, from the state of the church of Christ here among us since that time we may easily discover the falseness of your argument, and where the fallacy lies. In short, you understand the conversion of this nation, at different times, and by different persons, as one and the same conversion, when there was above five hundred years between them." You mistake yourself, Sir, and, would have me to follow your error. tell you again, I speak of this our English nation, not of the British nation. Now, the conversion of the English nation, which was the Saxon nation that came out of Germany;—the conversion, I say, of this nation, neither you, nor I, ought to understand at different times, nor by different persons, but at one time, to wit, in the year 596; for, in this year, christianity was first preached among them by St. Augustine and his companions, and daily increased till their thorough conversion, as may be seen in St. Bede.

Now, your mistake lies in the ignorantly confounding two nations of Britons and Saxons together, and so taking them, not for two distinct people, but for one and the same nation; whereas, they ever have been, and are, even at this day, two different and distinct nations, now vulgarly called Welch and English. Now speak on, Sir.

"You tell us how the church of England held communion with the church and pope of Rome, from the very first conversion of this our English nation from heathenism to christianity, till the reformation."

Yes, Sir, I do tell you this, and I tell you again it is a truth, which none but such a weak historian as Mr. Ritschel will presume to deny. I told you further, that St. Augustine, the monk, was the first that converted this nation to christianity; and to this you answer in these words. you would tell us by whom this nation was first converted, you discover the fallacy; for, Augustine, the monk, the pope's legate, came over here, and began to convert the Saxons in the year 596, which was above five hundred years after its first conversion in the apostles' days, which latter conversion of these Saxons, whom the Britons called in," &c.:-The fallacy lies in you, Sir, who will needs make two conversions of the Saxons. The first you will have to have been in the apostles' days: and that begun by St. Augustine in 596 you will have to be a second or latter conversion of those Saxons whom the Britons called in. Your error lies in mistaking the conversion of the Britons, in the apostles' days, for a conversion of Saxons, which it neither was, nor could be, because the Saxons entered not on the British shore till above four hundred years after the apostles' days; and, when they came, were all heathers, and continued in their infidelity till the year 596, when St. Augustine, as is said, came and preached to them the christian faith, and this plantation of the gospel among them, by him, was the very first conversion of this English nation, the Saxons, to christianity, as I told you before, out of St. Bede, F. Alford, and Cressy's church histories.

St. Peter, and St. Joseph of Arimathea, and

others, who brought the faith of Christ into this island in the apostles' days, taught it to the Britons, who were the first inhabitants. It was afterwards greatly propagated by St. Fugatius, and St. Domianus, missionaries sent from pope Eleutherius to king Lucius, but still among the Britons, there being, I say, no Saxon, or

English then in this island.

Admit, now, there had been, as you falsely affirm, two several conversions of the Saxons, the one in the apostles' time, the other in 596, yet, this speaks nothing to the contrary of what I affirm concerning the archbishop of Canterbury and church of England's holding communion with the church and pope of Rome, from St. Augustine's time to Thomas Cranmer's, which was about one thousand years. But, instead of speaking to this, you begin to give us a taste of your skill in chronology and church history, much to your credit, indeed!

I will thank you to inform me, whether your protestant bishops and clergy of the church of England derive their priesthood from the apostles, by the line of English bishops in the see of Canterbury succeeding St. Augustine, who was sent by St. Gregory, successor to St. Peter, in the church of Rome; or, you deduce it from those who first converted the Britons, by some line or other of British bishops independent of the see of Rome? If you derive it not by the British line, what advantage to you is that British conversion in the apostles' days? No more, sure, than the conversion of the Indians by the apostle St. Thomas.

As far as I can perceive by your discourse, you had rather have no priesthood, nor christianity at all, than think of deriving it from St. Augustine in communion with the church of Rome. You are strangely degenerated from your grand-

sire protestants, who lived in king Charles the First's time, and bishop Laud's. They, in Dr. Pocklinton's altare christianum, page 34, cry out thus: "Miserable were we, if he, who now sitteth archbishop of Canterbury, could not derive his succession from St. Augustine, St. Augustine from St. Gregory, and St. Gregory from St. Peter." After all this, you, big with rage, fall foul upon the holy St. Augustine, that great apostle of our English nation, who ventured his life among the pagan Saxons, to snatch them out of the jaws of infidelity. It is a wonder to me, that protestant spite should swell to such a degree, as to spit its venom against that holy saint, to whom we are all beholden, under God, for our christianity! Certainly, Mr. Ritschel, if you had been of English blood, as you are from the veins of an unknown alien, you would have had more respect and reverence for St. Augustine, than thus unjustly to accuse, and wrongfully calumniate him, as you do in your book, page 151, when you say, "Augustine complained to Ethelbert king of Kent, that the Britons would not obey him, and persuaded him to make war against them, who sent to Elfrede, king of Northumbria, to come and help him to distress the Britons, who, being afraid of so great power, sent men in their shirts and barefoot to beg pardon and mercy, but found none. For which reason, we think your Augustine does not deserve the name of saint, for, that, he was so notoriously guilty of those two aboninable vices of pride and cruelty: first, pride, because, he so disdainfully despised his brethren the British bishops, &c.: secondly, he was guilty of the most barbarous cruelty, in pro-curing the death of so many christians, but, esepecially, the poor unarmed monks about Bangor, because they would not submit to his jurisdiction." Thus you rail, and for authority cite

Stillingfleet and Jewel, two proper authors for such incredible stuff. If you had read the venerable St. Bede, the best and most ancient historian now extant of the English conversion, and of St. Augustine's life, sanctity, and miracles, you might have found the holy Saint under quite different characters from this you are pleased to give him.

Among many other things there written by St. Bede to St Augustine's great honour, he tells vou that" the king (Ethelbert) being much delighted with the purity of the life of St. Augustine and his companions and the example of their godly conversation, as also with their promises, which they proved to be true by the working of miracles, did believe and was baptized."-You may find much more in his praise in William of Malmsbury, in Huntingdon, Matthew of Westminster and Capgave, all authors of eminent credit; as also in several of your protestant writers that testify the admirable sanctity, holy life and great miracles of St. Augustine, not one of them charging him with either pride or cruelty. I shall give you some of their words.

Raphael Hollingshead, that famous protestant chronologer, in his description of Britain, writes of him thus. "King Ethelbert was persuaded by the good example of St. Augustine and his company, and their many miracles, to be baptized. Augustine and his company exercised the life of apostles in fasting, watching and prayers, preaching the word of God to as many as they could, despising all worldly pleasures, as not appertaining to them, receiving only of them whom they taught things seeming necessary to the sustenance of their life, and living in all points according to the doctrine they set forth." And, speaking of the difference between him and the Britons about keeping easter, he says, "Augustine, to prove his opinion good, wrought a miracle by restoring to sight one of the

Saxon nation that was blind." Thus writes Hollingshead. Your protestant bishop Cooper calls St. Augustine and his companions "godly and learned men." See anno 530. Your bishop Goodwin says, "he was a monk of great virtue:" and calls him "saint Augustine": relating also the said miracle. In vita S. Aug. John Stow in his chronicle says, "St. Augustine and his fellows lived in the fear of God." John Fox in his acts and monuments says of them: "at length, when the king had well considered their honest conversation, and moved with the miracles wrought through God's hands by them, he heard them more gladly; and lastly, by their wholesome exhortations and example of godly life, he was by them converted and baptized in the year 596." Tell me now, Sir, if St. Augustine, whose admirable sanctity of life, and miracles, are thus apparent, that even protestants themselves are forced to own and record them, is likely to be "a man of such intolerable pride and barbarous cruelty as you calumniate him with?

As to what you maliciously say of his pride, if you had considered his dignity, on the one hand, and the inferiority and impiety of the British bishops, on the other, reason might have told you that they were not deserving any honour from him. His not rising up to them, his inferiours, when they appeared before him, their superiour, in council, was no more sign of pride in him than it is in a king not to rise up from his throne to those to whom he gives audience; or, than it is in a judge not to rise from the bench to salute those who come to the bar: for St. Augustine, then and there in council, represented the pope himself, whose legate (as you own) he was, and therefore ought not to shew an equality to the British bishops, they being his inferiours, not his equals. But the pride was in them, in expecting from him

an honour which was not their due, nor proper by him, at that time, to be given them. Besides their contumacy, and schismatical disobedience, in refusing communion with him, and submission to his lawful jurisdiction, for so pitiful a reason as his not rising up to them; as also, their being resolved rather to forsake the doctrine which themselves had seen before confirmed by miracle, and owned to be true (as St. Bede says) than yield to him, were evident demonstrations of an

heretical and schismatical pride in them.

Besides, St. Augustine's humility and respect towards them is sufficiently testified by St. Bede, (lib. 2.) where he says "He and his companions honoured the Britons with great reverence while he thought they were catholics. He had no reason to give them any honour after he found them heretics, as he had done before this, and so uncharitable, as that they would not have any hand in preaching the faith of Christ to the heathen Saxons." Neither did their manners deserve any respect, they being, as St. Bede says, "unfaithful, naughty, and detestable people." And Gildas, their own countryman, writes," they were wolves, enemies of truth and friends to lies, enemies of God and not priests, merchants of mischief and not bishops, impugners of Christ, and not his ministers, more worthy to be drawn to prison, or to the cage, than to the priesthood." Thus the famous Gildas, with whom the protestant Fox in his Acts and monuments agrees, saying of them, that "all things, whether pleasing or displeasing to God, they regard alike; and not only secular men did this, but the bishops and teachers without distinction."

Judge, now, whether these men deserved honour from St. Augustine's hands. But God's heavy judgments upon them afterwards, and St. Augustine's prophecy that such would befall them for their obstinacy and disobedience (as in St. Bede) sufficiently testify his innocency, and their

guilt.

Your other calumny against the holy bishop is "barbarous cruelty, in procuring the slaughter of the Britons," as you falsely and impudently charged him with. But he is sufficiently defended against this, as well as the former, both by catholic and protestant writers. Your protestant bishop Bale was the first that broached this slanderous falsehood. After him John Jewel; then Abbots, then Sutcliff, then Stillingfleet, now you, -not one of you having the least testimonies from antiquity. Bale, the broacher, cites nobody, but tells us "some report," meaning, it is likely, himself and such as he had told it to; for none before himself can be named to have reported it; you cite Stillingfleet and Jewel, two of the most infamous inventers and maintainers of lies that ever wrote. You ought not to have taken things upon credit from such men, but rather to have gone to the fountain of English history, the venerable St. Bede. You would have found none of those scandalous calumnies in him; on the contrary, you may learn there, that St. Augustine never knew any thing of the said slaughter of the Britons, but only what was revealed to him by God in the gift of prophecy. He foretold to themselves several years before it happened: "and it came to pass" (says St. Bede) "by the secret workings of God's judgments upon that unfaithful and wicked people." Hows, one of your best protestant historians, speaks thus of the Britons. "St. Augustine proposed to them to celebrate easter in due time, to accomplish the ministry of baptism according to the Roman and apostolic church; and last, to preach with him to the Engglish nation the word of our Lord; but they would do none of these, neither would they account him

for their bishop, &c. to whom Augustine threatfully prophesied, that if they would not take peace and live in concord with their brethren, they should receive war from their enemies; and, if they would not preach to the Englishmen the way of life, they should suffer at their hands and by their power the vengeance of death: which thing came to pass afterwards." Thus writes Hows in his chronicle. Besides this destruction happened not till many years after the death of St. Augustine; it is not likely, therefore, that he should have a hand in procuring it. Your bishop Bale reports that the slaughter was committed in the year 615, whereas St. Augustine (if you will credit your own writers, John Stow and Hows) died in the year 604. Baronius also gathers the same out of St. Bede.

As to your relation of the story, you discover a great deal of ignorance, besides your several un-First, you tell us "that Elfrid, king of Northumberland, came to help king Ethelbert to distress the Britons:" whereas, of all the kings of Northumberland, not one is called by that name. Had you been as perfect in the English history as you pretend, you would have spoken it of Ethelfrid, not of an unbeing Elfrid; for it was the heathen king Ethelfrid that slew the Britons and menks of Bangor. Secondly, you tell us he came to help king Ethelbert. But this is also false; for Ethelbert had no wars with the Britons at that time, so that he could not come to help him that had nothing to do for him. Thirdly, you tell us that "the Britons being afraid of so great a power (as both kings joined together you mean) sent men in their shirts and barefoot to beg pardon." This is false. I would gladly know for what they begged pardon? was it for having opposed St. Augustine? Yet this is all the quarrel you pretend the two kings to have against them. You have no authority for their so great humility as either to submit or beg pardon for their fault. Further. who told you that Augustine complained to Ethelbert, king of Kent? and who heard him persuade Ethelbert to make war against them? and who let you understand that he sent to Elfrid king of Northumberland? All this is mystery revealed by Stillingfleet and Jewel to Mr. Ritschel, and those. with Bale, knew it only by some fanatic revelation a thousand years after it was pretended to have been done. A credible story indeed! no fewer than five or six lesser untruths supporting the two great one's of pride and cruelty! seven in one paragraph! Fox in his Acts and monuments might have taught you honesty; for he very ingenuously declares, "that it seems rather supposititious than true, that Ethelbert, being a christian king, could either so much prevail with a pagan idolater; or would attempt so far as to commit so cruel a deed." Upon this rational consideration he rightly ascribes the British slaughter, not to St. Augustine or king Ethelbert, but to "the fierce fury of Ethelfrid, the heathen:" and tells you farther, that "St. Augustine foretold the destruction, and, by the report of others, was dead before it happened." Thus that bitter protestant, Fox, is so far from charging St. Augustine with the cruelty, that, on the contrary, he acquits him of it, by owning his death before it happened, and acknowledges him a prophet in foretelling the judgment of God to fall upon them.

Now, Sir, concerning the pope's jurisdiction in this island before the coming of St. Augustine, or the Saxon conversion, and the epistle pretended to have been sent from pope Elutherius to king Lucius, you tell us, that "the latter conversion of those Saxons, whom the Britons called in, concludes nothing against the church of England, it being six hundred years after Christ when the

bishop of Rome began his usurpation. If you could prove that our Lucius who was the first christian king in all the world, did acknowledge the pope's jurisdiction and supremacy; it would fall within the compass of time we allow the church of Rome to have continued a pure virgin and undefiled."

Here is to be observed that you seem to allow the church of Rome to have continued a pure virgin and undefiled for complete six hundred years. What we have therefore to do is, to see what jurisdiction the said church of Rome exercised in this island among the Britons and Saxons during her said virgia purity; for what she did then, for the said six hundred years, must of necessity be right because it hart not her purity. In prosecution of this it is requisite that we begin from the planting

of the christian faith among the Britons

The great and glorious apostle, St. Peter, to whom our Lord gave the keys of the kingdom of heaven and pastoral authority over his whole flock, is by Simeon Metaphrastes affirmed to have preached the gospel, founded churches, and ordained priests, and deacons in this island of Britain. And Evsengrenius writes also, that "the first christian churches of Britain were founded by St. Peter in the time of Nero." St. Paul, the apostle, is also by Theodore, Fortunatus, and other authors reported to have preached the faith in Britain. St. Aristobolous, one of the disciples whom St. Paul salutes in his epistle to the Romans, was also sent into Britain by the apostle St. Peter, as Mermannus in Theatrum conversionis Gentium, Doroth: and Baronius out of the Greek martyrology write. St. Joseph of Aramathea is, by Capgrave, Polidore, Virgil, Camden, Harpsfield and others, reported to have come into Britain, and with his companions to have seated himself in Avalona, now called Glastenbury, in which they

built a church and dedicated it to the honour of the blessed Virgin Mary. See Antiq. Glastenb.

apud Capg:

Thus was the christian faith first planted in this island among the Britons; the two great apostles, St. Peter and St. Paul, who were the first founders of the church of Rome, being the chief agents in settling the same faith here; especially St. Peter himself who, as your protestant archbishop Whitgrift assures us, appointed bishops here. The apostle Peter," said he, "did in every province appoints one archbishop whom all other bishops of the same province should obey." See Whitgrift's answer to the admonition page 65, and his defence

of it, page 318.

Now the faith the first bishop or pope of Rome, St. Peter, planted here we find to have been frequently watered by his successors.—Mermannus affirms that "St. Anacosius being delegated hither by St Clement (pope) did instruct and inform the Britons and all the west of the ocean sea in the faith of Christ." Harrison in his Theatre lib I, agrees with him in the same. St. Anacletus, pope and snecessor to St. Clement, divided this island into bishopries; naming those who ruled in great cities, where the arch-flamins formerly sat, primates, and those of other cities he called metropolitans or archbishops. And this St. Anaeletus calls, not his own decree only, but, the decree of St. Clement his predecessor, and of St. Peter also: and appoints, what cities in particular were to have primates, both according to his own, St. Clement's and the apostle's order. Whence your protestant archbishop Matt. Parker himself in his. Intig. Brit. calls this division of the Britons in that respect, the division of this island according to the decree of pope Anacletus.

Here you see, Mr. Ritschel, a pastoral jurisdiction exercised by the popes of Rome in this island

even from St. Peter himself to his successor St. Anacletus, and that, not in small matters, but even in the constituting primates, and archbishops, and determining the very places where they were to reside; and this, not by advice only, but by positive and solemn decree. And this, I hope, is within the time you allow the church of Rome her virginal purity, as you express it. All this you seem to be ignorant of, at least, unwilling to take notice of it, and therefore you come to king Lucius, whom you call "our" king Lucius, as if he were a Saxon of our nation, or we Britons of his. But let this pass. "If king Lucius," you say, "had believed any such practice, or the bishop of Rome had then claimed any power and jurisdiction over these islands, you might have expected to have made some advantage of it. But, since the pope did then disown all such power and authority, and acknowledge king Lucius Christ's vicar in his ownkingdom, and to have full power and authority to settle affairs of religion in his own dominions: this is a plain evidence against you, and an undeniable argument to justify our reformation. And this appears from the advice of pope Elutherius to king Lucius, which we find in these words. You have received in the kingdom of Britain by God's mercy, both the faith and law of Christ. You have both the old and new testaments; out of them, through God's grace, by the advice of your realm make a law; and, by the same, by God's permission, rule your kingdom of Britain: for, in that kingdom you are God's viear. Now here we find," say you, "both a christian church and a christian king, and rule of faith, viz. the old and new testament, and a pope of Rome who disowned all power and authority over this island, even in ecclesiastical affairs, long before your St. Augustine was born, &c."

You have found a prodigious treasure here,

Mr. Ritschel, let us put it to the test and try of what value it is.

You are, in the first place, to understand, that the famous king Lucius, having a good opinion of the christian religion gained from the observance of good example and pious conversation of those few christians which then remained in this island from the first receiving the faith, as also from the good report he had heard of it from ambassadors to the holy pope Elutherius, desired him to send missionaries to instruct and baptize him and his people. Of which your protestant bishop Usher writes thus out of an ancient book belonging to the monastery of Abbington, namely, that "king Lucius, having heard the fame of the sanctity of preachers at that time in Rome, sent his messengers with public letters, with great expedition, beseeching the venerable pope Elutherius that by his order and will be might be made a christian. Thus writes Bede also. "The king's ambassadors were Elvanus and Medwinus, the first of whom was by the pope consecrated bishop, the other he made doctor. They were sent back by the pope with other two bishops named Fugatius and Damianus, the apostolic missionaries. Their commission was to instruct and baptize the king and such others as were willing to embrace the christian faith; and to erect two bishopries, ordain and dispense orders, and consecrate churches." This you may find recorded in Matthew of Westminster, Stow, Goodwin, Bale, and the Antiquit. Glastonb. And your protestant archbishop, Matthew Parker, says of Fugatius and Damianus: "These two religious men were assigned by pope Elutherius as chief workmen in governing so great a work, and establishing the discipline of the christian religion." And John Bale, your protestant bishop of Ossory, writes thus, "Pope Elutherius, as a

good master and governor of his family, did confirm and consolidate the Britons and the whole kingdom in the faith received by the apostles." Here, Sir, you may find one of your bishops acknowledge pope Elutherius for "master and governor of the family of Britain": here you may find your chief archbishop owning that the pope of Rome assigned governors and establishers of the same work of christian religion and discipline in this island.

Let us now examine the things you found in that pretended letter, sent (as you suppose) by the pope to the king. And, first, "here we find," say you, "both a christian church and a christian king." This is very well, Sir, but it would have been better if you had added, made such by order and appointment of the pope of Rome. What find you next? "A rule of faith, the old and new testament." Here you are mistaken, Sir; you find no mention of a rule of faith in all that epistle. Nor is the old and new testament appointed by that epistle for a rule for the Britons to frame their faith and religion by, as you would falsely insinuate when you cry you have "found a rule of fuith": because they had already received the faith and law of Christ, as that epistle tells you. It is nonsense to think that king Lucius, after he and his people had been instructed, taught and baptized in the faith and law of Christ, should still send to the pope to have the same done over again; or that the pope who knew them already to be taught and baptized in the true faith, should, notwithstanding, appoint them a bible for a rule whereby to make and form the faith and religion they had received. If you had considered that epistle as well as you ought, seeing you lay so much stress upon it, you might have easily discovered that all the use it appoints to make of the old and new testaments is only the making or composing out of them such a civil law as they

should think most proper and fit, whereby to rule the kingdom now become christian; their old pagan laws being now no longer proper nor convenient for the civil government of a christian kingdom. This you might have found still more evident if you had read the rest of that epistle, which I find you are ignorant of, for you carelesly content yourself with that small scrap of it you found in Jewel, who corruptly left out the chief parts of it, quoting only so much of it as he thought would be useful for his purpose, but concealing what he knew would stand against him, which "You require of us the Roman laws and those of the emperors to be sent over unto you to practise and make use of within your The Roman and emperor's laws we may ever reprove, but the laws of God we may not." Thus much Jewel and you leave out of it, as if it had never been any part of that epistle; which if you had put down, as honesty and plain dealing should have advised you, all that ever had read it might have seen, in clear and plain expressions, that king Lucius sent for the Roman or imperial laws, and not for the christian law or faith of Christ, which, as is said, he had received before: and consequently that law, which the pretended epistle bids him make out of the old and new testament, must be meant only of such civil or temporal laws as the king and his realm should think fit to draw up for the government of the kingdom in temporal concerns. What else find you there? "A pope of Rome, who disowned all power and authority over this island even in ecclesias-tical affairs." You have, Sir, a wonderful faculty in discovering, that can find out such a hidden treasure as that, where it neither is nor ever was. In all that pretended epistle you find not so much as the mention of ecclesiastical affairs, ecclesiastical authority, or power, or any spiritual jurisdiction

at all, nor of the pope's disowning any thing relating to church government, more than you find in Tom Thumb or Erra Pater. If you had dealt ingenuously in putting down the title of that epistle, you would have found in it a thing quite contrary to what you pretend to find. Its title is this. "Anno Domini 169 a passione Christi scripsit D. Elutherius papa Lucio regi Brittanniæ ad correctionem regis et procerum regni," that is "in the year of our Lord 169, from the passion of Christ, St. Elutherius pope wrote to Lucius king of Britain, to the correction of the king and nobles of the kingdom." Now this you and your master Jewel conceal from the sight of your readers, because it tells us the epistle was written to correct the king and nobles of the land: and for the pope to correct the king and nobility you could not endure, because it argues a superiority and jurisdiction in the corrector over those he corrects. And you would have been loath to have said from this title; here we find a pope of Rome owning a power and authority over this island even to the correcting of the king and nobility themselves. Is this fair dealing, Mr. Ritschel, to quote only half a sentence or small parcel of the epistle, such as you suppose may fit your purpose, and, at the same time, to leave out what plainly shews the contrary? But, to dealkindly to you, I shall impute it, as is said, to your knowing no more of it, rather than to wilful malice: for I really believe you never saw more of this pretended letter, except what you found in Jewel, for you begin it with him, and in his very words, (which are not altogether the same as in Fox) and then again you break it off with him as you come to the word ricar with an " &c."

But you will say, the pope calls the king God's vicar, and this is disowning all power and authority in ecclesiastical affairs, for it is upon this word,

I suppose, that you chiefly rely for ground to what you say. And to this I answer, that the pope's calling him vicar in temporal affairs does not make him vicar in spirituals, nor does the king's being God's vicar in temporals hinder the pope from being Christ's vicar in spirituals. It was in temporal or civil government only that he is here styled God's vicar or vicegerent, (as Hollingshead translates it) and cannot be understood of ecclesiastical or spiritual government, because, as is shewn already, the letter is speaking only of making, and ruling his kingdom by temporal laws. The pope, therefore, has neither disowned in himself, nor acknowledged in the king, any power or authority in ecclesiastical or spiritual affairs (as you would falsely insinuate) in this pretended epistle. that the king was God's vicar, substitute or vicegerent in his own dominions, in temporal matters, and as such had power and authority, as a sovereign prince independent of any other foreign power, to make temporal laws, and thereby to rule his kingdom, no catholic will deny either in him or any other lawful prince.

But what will you say, Sir, if, after all this, that epistle, pretended to be sent by pope Elutherius to king Lucius, be a fictitious and forged letter; and I promise you that there are several causes of suspicion, yea, evident tokens that is so. first place, its title speaks it to have been written by pope Elutherius in the year 169 after the passion or suffering of Christ: now if to this one hundred and sixty-nine years we add thirty-three which Christ lived before his passion, they make two hundred and two years from the birth of Christ, which will be eighteen years after pope Elutherius's death, for he died in the year of Christ 184, all authors agree. And surely you will not say the pope wrote it eighteen years after his own death.—Secondly, it is to be observed

that this pretended letter was never mentioned by any that we know of before John Fox, your Martyrologer, and he gives us no other authority for it than just putting down in his margin "ex vetusto codice regum antiquarum"; from an old book of ancient kings; without telling us either by whom or when this old book was written, or where to find it. This gives great presumption that he himself was the first author or forger of this letter. -Thirdly, Hollingshead, Hooker and Harrison, who, after Fox, make mention of it, put it down so different, both in words, sentences, and authorities, and texts of scripture, from that which Fox hath, as shews that none of them had any certain or ancient copy of it. Besides they leave out the title of it, though Fox puts it down as above; from which may reasonably be inferred, that those three looked upon it as of no great or good authority, as well as not truly delivered by Fox, their master, else they would not have presumed to mend it. It is very likely they thought themselves to have as good authority to mend it, as Fox had to invent it.—Fourthly, it quotes texts out of the Latin version of the vulgate Bible according to St. Jerome's translation, when that translation was not made till one hundred years after it is pretended to be written.—Fifthly, it speaks of the Britons having at that time the old and new testament; when, till above one hundred and sixty years after, it was not defined, what books of them were to be held for canonical. Nor can it be supposed that the Britons could then make any great use of them, being then only in the Hebrew, Greek and Caldaic tongues.—And lastly, there is false doctrine in that epistle, such as you yourself, and your church of England, dare not but own for false, and it is this, that "a king is no longer a king, only while he rules well" which is a Wickliffian and Waldensian heresy. The words of the epistle are these: "a

king hath his name of ruling, and not of having a realm: you shall be a king while you rule well, but, if you do otherwise, the name of king shall not remain with you, but you shall utterly loose and forgo it, which God forbid." Is this like the doctrine of the holy pope Elutherius, who lived so soon after the apostles' time, and when you allow the church of Rome to have been in her virgin purity. Now these words of the letters must either be held for false doctrine, or else you must so understand them, as if the pope by saving, "you shall be a king while you rule well, if otherwise you shall not have the name of king, but you shall loose it" &c. meant, that he should be no longer suffered by the see aposolic to be, or enjoy the name of a king, than he should rule well, which would be for the pope to hold a power in himself of deposing the king from his government and kingly name, if he ruled not well, or was guilty of maladminstration in government. such a power as this, I suppose, you will not say that St. Elutherius held in himself, or in any other pope; whathever you may think of the protestant church of England's having it, from her practice of it upon three kings, even in our times, one after another. For my part, it is no article of mine, nor of the catholic faith, that the pope has any power to depose a lawful king: much less that the protestant church of England has it.

In a word, if you will, after all this, have that pretended letter authentic, you must also allow its title, and this said doctrine to be authentic and good, which if you do, you must, according to the title, allow the pope (as is said) a power of correcting the king and nobility; and thus destroy your arguments against his supremacy. And you must also, according to the said doctrine, either say, that the pope held an erroneous tenet; or else, that he held to be in himself a power to de-

pose the king upon his not ruling well. To say he held false doctrine or heresy, will be to disallow the church to have been at that time pure, (unless you can make out that the pope and the church differed in doctrine) contrary to what you have allowed before. To say, he owned the power of deposing, will contradict and ruin your argument against the supermacy. In short, you had better agree with your protestant bishop Bramhall, that the said epistle is counterfeit, for he, in his vindication, could not but question it for counterfeit. And for a forged piece you must be forced to let it pass, considering all the said objections against it, though by this you are disappointed of all the rich treasure you dreamed you had found in it.

Trust no more to John Jewel, he does but fill your head with empty shadows. To do you a favour, I will shew you what kind of man he was.

CHAPTER II.

AN ACCOUNT OF JEWEL'S CHALLENGE, AND HIMSELF.
DETECTED FOR A CORRUPTER OF THE PRIMITIVE
FATHERS' WRITINGS.

IN your letter of May 2nd, page 6 and 7, you tell me your renowned bishop Jewel long ago made a famous challenge, viz: "If any learned men of our adversaries, or of all the learned men that be alive, be able to bring one sufficient sentence out of any old general council, or out of the holy scriptures of God, or any one example of the primitive church, whereby it may clearly and plainly be proved, that there was any private mass in the whole world at that time for the space of six hundred years after Christ &c: the conclusion is this, as I said before so I say now, I am content to yield, and subscribe. And he renews his challenge (say you) and applies it to each of the twenty-six following articles. If it be (say you) that you cannot produce sufficient evidence from the primitive church in favour of these doctrines that are now retained in the church of Rome &c. then it will follow, that she is not the catholic church." Thus you write concerning Jewel's challenge.

I observe here that you would insinuate into the heads of your unlearned readers, that this challenge was never yet answered by catholic writers, and that they never could produce evidence in defence of these doctrines. This you do, either out of ignorance, as not knowing they have been answered, or out of malice, designing to make your readers think the challenge unanswerable, and the opposed doctrines not capable of being defended. To hinder, therefore, their being thus deceived, I shall give them a further understanding

of the matter, and tell them by whom that challenge of Jewels' was sufficiently answered.

About the year of our Lord 1560, this same Jewel made certain challenges, partly in his summons at Paul's cross and at the court, and partly in his letters to Dr. Cole, wherein he challenged all men, without exception of the Roman eatholie religion, upon above twenty articles. To this the learned Dr. Harding (then beyond the seas) made answer in writing. In the mean while Jewel published a book called The apology of the church of England; though without his name affixed to it; yet he afterwards owned it to be his. To this Dr. Harding answered, calling his answer, A confutation of the apology of the church of England. In the year 1566, Jewel put forth another great book in folio, terming it, A reply to Dr. Harding's answer to his challenge and article. Upon this, the eatholic Doctors, then beyond seas in banishment, divided their labours some writing against one part of it, some against other parts, and clearly confuting the whole work.

Dr. Harding wrote two Rejoinders against four articles of it. Dr. Sanders wrote several books against other articles of it; viz. The rock of the church, against the fourth; another On the real presence, against the fifth; a third On images, against the fourteenth. Dr. Stapleton wrote his Return of untruths, against the four first articles. Dr. Heskins published a large book in folio, entitled, The parliament of ancient father's for the real presence. Dr. Points wrote another also on the real presence. Dr. Allen wrote one book On purgatory, another on The authority of priests. Mr. Rastal published several books against Jewel, one entitled, Beware of Mr. Jewel; a second ealled The confutation of Mr. Jewel's sermon at Pauls cross; the third, A replyagainst a false named defence of the truth; a fourth, A brief shew

of the false wares patched together in the named Apology of the church of England. Mr. Martial at that time wrote a book On the cross, and honour due to it, and, afterwards, a defence of the same

against Mr. Calfhill.

In the year 1567, Mr. Jewel put forth his defence of the apology. &c. against which Dr. Harding, in the following year, published his answer called, The detection of foul errors, lies, corruptions, and other false dealings of Mr. Jewel in his defence of the apology; which detection contained five several books, and put Jewel to silence; so that, he never after had the confidence to appear in print, or to write one syllable in his own vindication, but contented himself to sit down, with great shame and confusion, under the opprobrious brand of a lying impostor, which will blast him among all honest men, that know his writings, till he make his public appearance, under it, to all the world at the day of judgment.

Dr. Harding, in his epistle before his first Rejoinder, tells you, that himself and Dr. Sanders discovered, in examining only the first five of his twenty-six articles, above a thousand untruths. "Imagine then," says he, "what number is like to arise out of the whole work; whereas neither fear nor shame evald withhold him from uttering

such a huge number."

Mr. Walsingham, in his book entitled A search into matters of religion, dedicated to king James the first, takes notice of a great number of untruths and corruptions of the fathers wilfully committed by Mr. Jewel, Calvin, Luther, Morton, Willet, Dove, Rogers, Sutcliffe, and other protestant writers, and declares, that their lies, corruptions, and deceitful dealings were the cause of his leaving the protestant opinions, and embracing the eatholic faith, though he was a deacon. Mr. William Reynolds testifies, also, that the discovery

of Jewel's falsehood was the cause of his own conversion to the catholic religion. Take here a few examples of Jewel's false dealings, and then judge what kind of master you have chosen to instruct you in your art of writing controversy

and quoting the fathers.

First, this precious Jewel, in his sermon preached at St. Peters in Oxford, in the lent time, endeavouring to defend the marriages of priests, and of such votaries as had before made solemn vows of perpetual chastity, (which marriages, notwithstanding the vow he would have to be lawful and no sin,) in proof of his doctrine cites St. Augustine lib. de bono vid., thus, "Wherefore, I cannot say of women, who are fallen from a better purpose, (of chaste life) if they marry, that their marriage is adultery, and no marriage." here Jewel breaks off in the half-sentence without giving the rest of St. Augustine's words, which are these, "but, I do not doubt to affirm, that the ruins and falling away from more holy chastity, which is vowed to God, are worse than adulteries." Thus writes St. Augustine; yet your Jewel, by corruptly cutting off half the sentence, would make him speak quite the contrary. Secondly, in his defence of the apology, defending the marriage of priests and bishops, he corruptly cites the histories of Cassiodorus, Zozomen and Nicephorus. These authors, writing in the praise of Euptychius, a senator's son of Caesarea in Cappadocia, highly commend him for fortitude, in leaving his new-married wife and all things else that were dear to him in the world, and courageously suffering martyrdom for the faith and love of Christ. Now Jewel calls the said young nobleman bishop of Cæsarea, citing the said authors for his testimonies that the bishop of Casarea was married; whereas, not one of them makes the least mention of his being bishop or priest, but they rather shew that he was a layman, by giving him the title of Patricius. But Jewel deceitfully suppresses the word Patricius, and adds of his own, contrary to the history, that he was a bishop. Thus, by changing Patricius, into Episcopus, he would prove it law-

ful for bishops and priests to marry.

Thirdly, he corrupts the words and meaning of the third council of Carthage, where St. Augustine was present, quoting it thus. "The old council of Carthage commands nothing to be read in Christ's congregation but the canonical scriptures." And he stops, without going on with the following words, which are, "under the name of divine scriptures." He also leaves out the other explication which follows in the same council, namely, "It is lawful, also, to read in the church the passion of the martyrs, when their yearly festival days are celebrated." Thus he makes the council speak what it never designed.

Fourthly, he corruptly falsifies the words of pope Leo, telling us in his apology, that Leo pope holdeth, that upon one day it is lawful to have but one mass in one church. And for this he cites Ep. 8 ad Dioscor; episcop. Alex. c. 2. But those who please to read the place will find that the pope ordained unto the said Dioscorus, bishop of Alexandria, that "several masses be said in one church upon one day," so that the pope held and appointed it quite contrary to what Jewel

affirms him to hold.

Fifthly, against the real presence of Christ's body and blood, in the holy sacrament this Jewel corrupts the council of Nice, saving in his apology, "the council of Nice, as is alledged by some, in Greek plainly forbids us to be basely affected or bent towards the bread and wine which are set before us." And here he breaks off. But the words of the council, when rightly de-

livered, are these; "let us not, at the divine table, basely behold the bread and chalice set before us; but, lifting up our minds, let us by faith understand, that on the holy table is laid the lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world, sacrificed unbloodily by the priests: and, receiving his precious body and blood verily, let us believe these to be the pledges of our resurrection." Thus the council speaks clearly for the real presence and unbloody sacrifice. Yet the Jewel had the confidence to cite only a part of the sentence

for the contrary.

Sixthly, also against the real presence, in his apology, he deceitfully quotes part of St. Chrysostom's words from Hom. 24, and leaves out the rest that explains them. "As Chrysostom very aptly writes" says he, "we say that the body of Christ is the dead carcase, and we ourselves must be the eagles; meaning thereby, that we must fly high if we come to the body of Christ. For the table, as Chrysostom saith, is a table of eagles, not of jays." Thus Jewel would have us to take St Chrysostom to mean, that we cannot come to the body of Christ, unless we fly into heaven, that is, we cannot have Christ's body here in the sacrament. Whereas, if he had proceeded farther in the said homily, he would have given us to understand that St. Chrysostom, by the eagles' flight, means no more but that we must raise our thoughts and affections from all earthly things, when we come to the body of Christ. The words of St. Chrysostom, when he explains the former, are these, "I name eagles to shew, that he must get him upon high that cometh to the body of Christ; and that he must have nothing to do with the earth, neither be drawn down by base things and creep, but always fly upwards, and behold the son of righteousness &c. Wipe away all filth from thy soul, prepare

thy mind to receive these mysteries. If the king's child, arrayed in purple and a diadem, were delivered unto thee to bear, wouldst thou not cast down on the ground all that thou heldest in thine hands, and receive him? But now, when thou dost receive, not the king's child, but the only begotten son of God, tell me, I pray thee, art thou not afraid? and dost thou not cast away all love of worldly things, and adorn thyself with him alone? dost thou yet look down on the earth? art thou yet in love with money? &c. If so, what excuse or forgiveness shalt thou find?" This is that spiritual flight St. Crhysostom required; not meanining, I say, that the body and blood of Christ is not here in the eucharist; for, in the very same homily, he further declares the body Christ to be present here on earth, meaning in this holy sacrament, yea, "that very body which," says he, "was nailed and beaten, which was not overcome by death, which the sun seeing crucified turned away his beams, for which the veil of temple was rent asunder, the rocks and the earth quaked, the body that was made all bloody, and being pierced with a spear poured forth blood and water to the health of all the world." If Mr. Jewel had gone on with these words of St. Chrysostom, he had shewn us that Christ's precious body is in the sacrament in this earth, as well as at the right hand of his father in heaven. Yea, the same St. Chrysostom tells us, in the same homily, that, while we are in this life, this mystery is the cause that the earth, to us, becomes heaven. "Ascend therefore," says he, "to the gates of heaven, not of heaven, but the heaven of heavens; there observe diligently, and thou shalt see what we say; for truly I shall shew thee upon earth that which is worthy of the highest honour. I shew thee not angels nor archangels, not heaven, nor the heaven of heavens, but the king's body, which is in heaven,

now is set before thee on earth to be seen. The Lord of all these do I shew thee; observest thou not, that thou not only beholdest on earth that which is the greatest of all things, but even touchest it: nor dost thou only touch it, but thou eatest it, and having received it, returnest to thine own house." All this Jewel deceitfully left

out and omitted in the same homily.

In your forty-fifth page, you charge the canonists with telling you, that the pope may dispense with the law of God,—with the law of nature,—with the new testament;—nay, that he may abolish the law of God in part, &c.: and for all this you cite bishop Jewel. The bringing of Jewel for your author is enough to speak it is all false; in very deed it is. If you have the *Corpus juris canonici* by you, examine the citation of Jewel for all those blasphemous scandals, and then tell me how many of them you find true.

However, seeing that you told me, in our conference in Hexhamshire, that our canon law teaches, that fornication is no sin; and with so much confidence you affimed it, that it was apparent you as certainly believed it as you do any one article of your creed; seeing, I say, you affirm this with so much assurance and for so great a truth, I shall take the pains to shew you, how wretchedly you are imposed upon by this great oracle, Jewel, out of which you, poor credulous gentleman, have taken it without examining into the truth of it.

Seventhly, your dusky Jewel, then, in his apology, writes it thus. "Let him (the pope) remember, that they are his own canonists who have taught the people, that fornication between single persons is no sin." And for this canonist, his author, he cites in his margin Joannes de Magistris de temperantia; whereas, in the first place, there is no such man as Joannes de Magistris,

de temperantia; whereas, in the first place, there is no such man as Joannes de Magistris, author of the book de temperantia but the name of that author is Martinus; neither is he a canonist, as Jewel calls him, but a school divine. Now, this Martinus, in his said book de temperantia, proposes the question, "whether simple fornication be a mortal sin, or not?" And then, disputing the matter for and against, after the manner of the schools, concludes finally that "fornication is a mortal sin." He then proves it to be a mortal sin by six several conclusions, and solves the objections on the other side, proving also out of St. Paul, that fornication excludes out of the kingdom of heaven. Thus, Sir, your father of lies, John Jewel, not only falsifies the name of the author of the book de temperantia, and his degree and office, citing for a canonist, when he was only a scholastic, and this on purpose to hide the deceit from the knowledge of his ignorant readers; but he also makes the author of the book speak and teach an impious doctrine, where he affirms and proves quite the contrary.

As Jewel has imposed upon you in this, so has he done in those above detected calumnies, for which you cite him against St. Augustine, the monk. For, in his reply, page 185, he rails against that holy missienary in this manner. "He was," says he, "a man, so it was judged by those that saw and knew him, neither of an apostolic spirit, nor any way worthy to be called a saint, but a hypocrite, and a superstitious man, cruel, bloody,

and proud out of measure."

Thus writes he, and you take it for an unquestionable truth, when it is certain he could not but know, when he wrote it, that nothing is more false. Consider of it yourself, Sir. He assures you, that St. Augustine was judged such a man by those who saw and knew him. But there is no

writing, at this day extant, of any man that either saw or knew him, save only of pope Gregory the great, who sent him and exceedingly commends him; and, as for St. Bede, who lived not long after him, yet not so near his time as to see and know him, he writes highly in his commendation, and not one word against him. His epitaph, indeed, was remaining upon his tomb, till the effects of your pretended reformation may have crased it, but it is altogether in his praise, being this in English. "Here resteth the body of St. Augustine, first bishop of Canterbury, that was sent into this land by St. Gregory, bishop of the city of Rome; approved of God by the working of miracles; who brought Ethelbert, and all his people from the worshiping of Idols unto the faith of Christ."

This ancient monument is too strong a shield for Jewel's strokes to touch him. But whom, think you, Jewel cites for the man that saw and knew St. Augustine? No one but Jeffrey of Monmouth, whose name he puts down in his margin. Now, this Jeffrey was not born till about five hundred years after St. Augustine was dead. So that, if Jeffrey saw him, it was five hundred years before he had eyes in his head. Neither does this Jeofrey of Monmouth make any such report from others against St. Augustine, nor is there so much as one single word, either from himself or from the Britons or from any other author whatsoever, of his being either a hypocrite, superstitious, cruel or bloody. As for pride, falsely charged against him by the British bishops, for not rising up to them, he is cleared from it, as well as from your other calumnies, above. At this rate deals Mr. Jewel with his authors. I could fill a volume with his lies, falsifications and corruptions, but, for brevity's sake, I shall refer you to some few places more in his works, where you may examine him yourself if you think it worth your while.

In his Defence of the apology, he corrupts St. Jerom, St. John Chrysostom, and the holy gospel itself, against the pope's supremacy. In page 109, he again corrupts St. Jerom, against the superiority of bishops. In page 134, he falsifies St. Cyprian, against the traditions of ancestors. page 164, of the same book, he abuses the testimonies of Origen, St. Ambrose, and Ignatius, in behalf of the marriages of priests and votaries. In his apology, he gives the lie to St. Augustine in four several places, against purgatory; and all this in less than five lines. In his reply, he corrupts the words of the emperor Justinian, against the supremacy of the pope, in which he is guilty of four notorious deceits in one paragraph. In his said defence, he corruptly falsifies the words of our blessed Saviour himself, saying "by succession Christ saith, that desolation shall sit in the holy place, and antichrist shall press into the room of Christ, citing for it Mat. 24. but in all that chapter the word succession is not once named, nor antichrist pressing into the room of Christ. he makes the scripture speak, on purpose to make the succession of the popes to be antichrist. In fine, when you have examined these places, and perused the above mentioned books written against him, then tell me, if this false and counterfeit Jewel be of sufficient value for you to write your salvation upon?

CHAP. III.

THE FABLE OF A FEMALE POPE, OR THE HISTORY OF POPE JOAN DETECTED FOR A RIDICULOUS FICTION.

IN your book, page 159, you ridiculously fall upon a female pope,—a pope Joan, forsooth! "Suppose," say you, "the pope should be a woman, as in the case of pope Joan, what a strange catholic and apostolic church would this be, without a priesthood! That there was such a woman," you say, page 167, "that she fell sick and was delivered of a child, &c.: this is matter of fact which may easily be proved." A brave story! all matter of fact! may easily be proved! yet not one word of proof, nor the least sign of evidence. I told you long ago, that things would never pass with me upon your own bare word. Could any one have imagined that you, learned Sir, who lay so much stress upon the truth of this female pope, as by her to pretend to break asunder the chain of apostolical succession, and annihilate the priesthood of the catholic church, should thus send her abroad into the world without the least testimony that it is she. You and she may stand long knocking at the gates of the church of St. Peter, before you will get her there registered among the popes, unless you have letters of credence, and good evidence, that she has formerly had a title to the apostolic chair.

But come, my dear Mr. Ritschel, tell me, why you have not proved it? If you want evidence, deal but ingenuously, and let me know, and, upon my word, I will do all that possibly can be done to help you out; for, believe it, I know the best evidence the protestant republic has among all her

records. Speak then, I say, why did you not prove it? Well, I will be so kind as to guess the reason, seeing you are too bashful to tell it. It is this then; you had it from the grave vicaress dowager your mother, for she was maid of honour to the popess herself, was present at all her travels and transactions, and, for want of another, was forced to midwife her child into the world, and herself out of it at the same time. My reasons for this conjecture are, first, this prudent lady, your mother, declares it a principle of her religion, to believe nothing but what she sees, feels and understands, by either all, or at least some, of her bodily senses. Now, this otherwise incredible story of a pope Joan she frequently relates; and, upon all occasions, in discourse both with catholics and protestants, when she goes to proselyte the one or confirm the other, she makes it the principal and almost the only argument. She affirms it for as great a truth as any one article amongst the whole thirty-nine, not only believing it herself, but always wondering how any body can deny it! Now, she, I say, believing nothing but what she hears, sees, tastes and touches, &c., and believing this of pope Joan, as she does, it follows, therefore, for undeniable, that she was present, and heard, saw, felt and understood, by her external and corporal senses, all the transactions, carriages, and miscarriages of the said pope Joan.

Have I guessed right, Sir? If not, I will guess again. You had it from the apology of your great master, John Jewel, and, the misfortune of it is, he gives you there no authority at all for it himself. Now, to have cited him to evidence, you verily foresaw (seeing he names none to evidence it to him) could be to no purpose, but, would rather pester you with this query,—Jewel tells it you, but who told it Jewel?

You are, therefore, not to be blamed; for, why should you be reproved for not speaking the thing you knew not. Only, I think you had better have omitted these words, "it may easily be proved." Well, Sir, I love not to have you remain in your ignorance. Be attentive, then, and I will relate all that need be said either for, or against it.

The first, then, that ever sent this fiction from his pen was one Martinus Polanus. He begins it thus: Joannes, Anglicus natione; Maguntius &c." that is "John, an Englishman, by nation, of Mentz, sat two years one month and four days, alias, five months and three days." This begins not like a truth. He says she was an Englishman, then she was a Maguntian; that is to say, an Englishman born at Mentz in Germany: for all know, that the city Mentz, or Maguntia is situate in Germany. Now, how this woman could be an Englishman, and born a Dutchman, is what I cannot unriddle; I leave it therefore for you.

"This" says Martin, "was a woman, as it is said, and, in the young age of a girl, she was brought to Athens &c, and there profited so much in divers sciences, that no one was found that could be compared to her." This Englishman is now a woman, "as it is said"; for he brings no other authority for it but only a bare hearsay. "She went to study at Athens," says this fabulous hearsay, a thing not to be supposed possible by those who know, that, at that time when she is reported to have lived, the city of Athens was all in rubbish, and no learning professed or taught there; it being destroyed long before and the whole country of Attica become barbarous and utterly void of learning, as may be seen in Zonaras and Cedrenus. So that, if she got her learning there, she must have been taught it by stones and rubbish, not by men of learning.

"From Athens," he tells you, "she came to Rome, and there professed learning openly, and had great doctors for her scholars." But this is not credible to those who consider, that the learning she had was picked up out of the ruins of a demolished city,—Athens. Nor is it very likely, that the Roman doctors should turn horn-bookboys, to come to school to her; nor can it be supposed, that Rome, where learning has always flourished, should be at so low an ebb for learning, as to stand in need of such a school-mistress to teach their best doctors.

"By the common consent of all," says Martin Hearsay, she was chosen pope." But, this is as far from the truth as the other. For it is certain, that, from the first century, none was made pope (lawfully) till the days of pope Formosus (who was the eighth after this pretended pope Joan is said to have been) but such as had, from their youth, been known to have been brought up in the church of Rome, and in it to have taken their ecclesiastical degrees of orders to their being made priests. It is not likely, therefore, that an unknown woman, of uncertain stock and country, without any testimony of her former life, and without any evidence of having passed through ecclesiastical orders to the degree of priesthood, should, by the unanimous consent of all, or indeed of any, be chosen pope.

In short, "she became pregnant by her servant," says Martin, "and, not knowing the time of her delivery, as she went from St. Peter's to the Lateran, she brought forth and died, and, as they say, was there buried." Thus ends his story, without any more or better testimony of her child-bearing and death, than what he had of her birth; only

"as they say" is his author for all he says.

This has no more appearance of truth in it than the former: it is very unlikely, that she and a

former lover of hers, who, he says, went with her to Athens, should cohabit together all the time of her youth, and not have the luck to conceive with child by him, and yet, in her old withered age, to assume the vigour of youth and bring forth to a servant. Nor is it very probable she should be then going from St. Peter's to the Lateran; for, at that time, and till many hundred years after, viz, till the days of pope Boniface the ninth, none of the popes ever lived at the Vatican, where St. Peter's stands. It is not likely, therefore, that she should be going from thence where her abode was not. But, you will say, she might first come thither from the Lateran; but Martin does not tell she did. Besides, it is too great a journey for a woman on the point of delivery to take off and on, it being two full miles from the one place to the other.

But you will say with Martin, she knew not the time of her delivery. This then would be a sign that she was not of such great learning and sound judgment, as is reported. Can it be imagined, that she should either not know she was with child at all, or not know how long she had already advanced in her pregnancy, or not know how long other women in that condition went, or not perceive that she was not in a fit state for taking a walk of four miles? Can it, I say, be supposed, that a woman, ignorant in things thus belonging her own sex, should be, in other matters, of so great learning, wit, judgment and vast understanding, as to be capable of teaching the learned Roman doctors in public schools, or capable of being made pope? On the other hand, if she were so qualified in all things as to be thought fit to be pope, can it be imagined, that she should not know the time of her delivery, if not to an hour, or perhaps to a day, yet, at least, to be so near as to think herself unable to perform a journey

from the Vatican to the Lateran church, in one day? Or, can she be thought so imprudent, as to hazard herself, and so far endanger the exposing her situation, which, it seems, she had kept so long hid from the eyes of any body? Besides, how incredible it is, that she could so conceal her pregnancy, and so far dissemble her sex as neither by voice, countenance, gestures, features, want of beard, person, or other circumstances, be discovered, nor once suspected, to have been what she was, at least, by so wise a people as the Romans.

From Martin Polanus, who, as it is said, first related the fable, Platina took it, yet did not give much credit to it himself, saying "he had it from uncertain and obscure authors." And if you please to read the annotation of Onuphrius upon Platina, printed at Venice, you will see the whole

story detected for a gross untruth.

From Polanus and Platina vou protestants take up the fable, for it is sweeter to you than a real truth would be, if less scandalous. But the different manners of relating it shew the falsehood of it. As to her name, some call her Agnes, some Isabella, some Jutte, others Dorothy. And, as to her place among the popes, some assign it between Leo the fourth and Benedict the third, whereas between these the see was only vacant fourteen days, as is evident from Anastasius Bibliothecarius, who lived at that time, and wrote the lives of the popes up to Nicholas the first, who suceeded Benedict the third, and, as he himself says, was at the creation of Sergius the third, Leo the fourth, Benedict the third, Nicholas the first, Adrian the second, and John the eighth. This author's book is extant. You may also find his words set down in Onuphrius: so that she could not find a two years vacancy in the place Polanus puts her. Others there are, who, observing this, thrust her in after Leo the fifth; others

after Martin the first; others after Nicholas the first; some will have her to be John the seventh, others John the eighth. But John the seventh was a Grecian born, and lived nineteen years before Polanus's pretended Joan. And John the eighth was a Roman, and was twenty years after Polanus's pope Joan: so neither of these could be Englishmen, or Germans. Onuphrius learnedly proves by the account of years and times (which is a certain way) that none such, nor any other, besides those true popes he mentions, could have been two years in the see, without taking away the known time that others possessed it. So that, vou see there is no time nor place to be found for her among the popes. Martin Polanus wrote in the year 1320, and this pope Joan he pretends to have been in the year 870, which was four hundred and fifty years before. Author for it (as is said) he brings none, nor was it possible he should, for of all those who wrote before him not one mentions any such thing, as the said Anastasius, Ademanus and Annonius of Paris, Regio, Herman Shafnaburgensis, Otho Frisingensis, Abbas Urspargensis, Leo bishop of Hostia, Joannes of Cremora and Godfrid Viturbiensis, of whom some wrote three hundred, some four hundred years ago. Bibliotheca Platina at Rome six or seven tables of the pope's names are written in several books, yet not any thing of this imaginary pope Joan in any one of all these authors. Neither is any thing found in the five books of Damasus, and of Pandulphus of Pisa, which treat of the pope's lives; only in the margin of Pandulphus this fiction is put down in another hand, written in different characters from those of that ancient book, added by some of later times, which still renders it the more suspected for fabulous. In the most ancient and true copies of Sigebertus the same is not to be found, yet in some later editions it is

added, which still shews it fictitious: and even in these there is no other authority for it, but only, "fama est," ("it is said") which shews it to be added to those later editions out of Polanus. Jewel says, in his margin of the apology, that, "the image of a woman pope lying in travel is yet to be seen in Rome," which is a notorious untruth, as doctor Harding, in his confutation of Jewel's apology, has clearly made appear.

Though enough has been said to detect and disprove this foolish and ill-contrived fiction, yet I will close the matter with the judgment of four learned French protestants, who have ingenuously

declared it a lying report.

Mr. Blondel wrote a book designedly against it, in which he has strongly confuted it for a fabulous and vain story. This book of his was printed at Amsterdam in Holland, in the year 1647. Seravius, in a letter of his to Salmasius, mentions Blondel's book with great applause, and adds these words. "Do not imagine, that Blondel was either the first, or only man, of our persuasion (protestant) that has been of this opinion, (that it is an untruth) although, perhaps, no man has handled this matter with more forcible arguments: for, there have been famous divines of the reformed religion of the same opinion. And there are yet living in this city men famous for policy and piety, who heard this history, though vulgarly credited, accounted fabulous from the mouth of Chemerius himself. I myself, says he, lately saw letters of your and my very good friend Peter Dumoulin, in which he affirmed, that he always believed the same as Chemerius did, to wit, that it is fabulous. And I have by me also one of Bocharb's, wherein he declares that, whatseever has been hitherto published in favour of this affair (of a pope Joan) to the world, is merely vain and fictitious." All this Monsieur Seravius wrote in

his letter to Salmasius, which his son, after his death, caused to be printed and published.

Thus, at last, you have four of the most learned and eminent protestants in France exploding this old wife's tale of a pope Joan for a malicious lie.

And for such I leave it you for pulpit-stuff.

After all this, admitting even that this romantic fable had been as true as you can wish, what worse would the church of Rome be? and what better would your protestant kirk be? Yes! yes! you say; "what a strange catholic and apostolic church would this be without a priesthood, that sex not being capable of holy orders." Say you so, Sir! If this be true, that then the church would want priesthood, she would be in as wretched a case as are all the protestant congregations in foreign parts, who, as I have shewn you above, from their own letters, do as certainly want priesthood as it is certain that episcopacy is of divine right; and this is held certain, and a point of faith, by your protestant church of England, and our catholic church of Rome.

Seeing the female sex is incapable of holy orders, as you truly speak, it follows, that your said Joan could neither be priest nor pope; and, therefore, if such a thing as this Joan could possibly have got herself called pope for two years, five months and three days; yet this none-pope could no more interrupt the line of succession, nor destroy or hurt the priesthood of the church, than the vacancy between the death of one true pope and the election of another can prejudice it; for, it would have been so long a time of vacancy. Did a queen Jane, or an Oliver Cromwell, interrupt the royal line of the house of England? You dare not say they did, lest you contradict that maxim in law, that the king never dies. think any christian, but a Ritschel, will believe, that the priesthood of the church is more firmly

and securely established, for perpetual duration, than any kingship in the world, seeing the Holy Ghost says of it, thou art a priest for ever, ac-

cording to the order of Melchisedech.

Though I comply with you in speaking thus much, yet, truly, I am ashamed to spend time in answering such nonsense. Notwithstanding, a little more may yet be said. If the priesthood of the church of Rome was destroyed by a pope Joan, pray tell me, how your pretended church of England could come by her priesthood, if she has any? I dare say you will not deny but all the priesthood your church has was originally received from the hands of the Roman catholic bishops.—But, if they had none to give, you could get none; and then, as you say, God knows, in what a sad case you are. I may well compare you to that envious wretch, that wished he might loose both his eyes, on condition his neighbour might loose one of his.

Again, if the priesthood of the church of Rome was lost by this female pretended pope, your protestant church must, by the same reason, loose its priesthood by that female protestant pope, Elizabeth. Deny this Elizabeth to have been a woman I suppose you will not; and deny her to have been head of the church you cannot, unless you dare take upon you to contradict the statutes of the realm, in the acts of your protestant parliaments.

I ask you therefore, again, what good can possibly accrue to your protestant church of England by either a pope Joan or a pope Bess? By a pope Bess, say I? Let me recall this word; for, now that I reflect on it, if you had not had that pope Elizabeth to have headed your kirk, and wall it about with penal laws you had had no protestant kirk in England at this day, either with or without the priesthood.

CHAPTER IV.

YOUR EXAMINATION OF THE TREE OF LIFE IS AN EVIDENT DEMONSTRATION OF MR. RITSCHEL'S INFIDELITY.

I have searched and examined," you say page 161, "your tree of life over and over again, from the top to the bottom, but cannot find in it the holy, catholic and apostolic church; nor do I expect to find the catholic church in your tree, any more than to find it in some tree in the world, in the moon &c. Nor can I find, in your tree of life, any of the primitive apostolic churches, as the church of Jerusalem, Alexandria, or Antioch &c. nor so much as one other christian church, since the apostles' days, and, therefore, I conclude that your notion of the catholic church (viz, that your tree of life is the one, holy, catholic and apostolic church,) is false and absurd &c. Your tree, indeed, at first sight, makes a show, but, when I come to examine the fruit thereof, I find it as bitter as gall and wormwood, and fitly to be compared to those apples, which are said to grow by the lake of Sodom, which seem very beautiful to the eye and pleasant to outward appearance, but mightily deceive a man's expectation when he comes to touch them, they being full of dirty ashes." This is the account you give of your search and examination of the tree of life.

Him who will not hear the church, we are commanded to look upon as a heathen: and can we, then, take him for less than an infidel, who will neither hear nor see the church, but, with blasphemous lips, compares her pastors and professors to gall, wormwood and apples of Sodom full of dirty ashes. If I had not seen it thus under your hand, Mr. Ritschel, I could never have believed

you would have put such a censure upon the tree of life. You examined and searched it over and over again, you say, from the top to the bottom. Tell me, if in this strict examination and diligent search you found not the representation of our blessed Saviour's death upon the cross, from whose life, doctrine, miracles, bitter passion and precious blood, the holy catholic church has sprung, and by whom it has been conserved? Did you not also find the great apostle St. Peter and his successors the popes, bishops of Rome, succeeding to one another even to this our present pope? Could you not see the other apostles and evangelists, nor the holy fathers, doctors, and eminent writers, in every age? Saw you not a great many provincial, national, and general councils, composed of bishops and fathers out of all parts of the church? Did you not also meet with numbers of saints, martyrs, and eminent public professors, in every age? And found you not also the names of nations converted to Christianity, in all parts of the world; by which particular names are not only denoted particular churches, but by all together is represented the christian church, and its spreading over the whole earth? Could you, I say, examine the tree of life, and not meet with all this? No, it is impossible!

In the columns of the nations converted, you might have found Jerusalem, Antioch, Ephesus, Britain, with the christian conversions both in Africa, Asia, and Europe, and all this in the first and second ages. In the following ages, you might have found the christian faith planted in Scotland, Ireland, England, France, Spain, Germany, Greece, and other places through the Roman world, and no doubt but when you so strictly examined the tree of life you found all those and the church of Rome itself, with the nineteen general councils &c. And could not all these,

with whatever else is to be found in the tree of life, represent to you the catholic church, nor so much as one particular church? "No" say you, "I cannot find from the top to the bottom of your tree either the catholic church, nor any of the primitive churches, since the apostles' days.

With you, Mr. Ritschel, all those holy fathers, St. Ignatius, St. Justin, St. Dionysius, St. Polycarp, St. Irenœus, St. Basil, St. Athanasius, St. Jerom, St. Ambrose, St. Augustine, St. Gregory, St. Chrysostom, St. Thomas Aquinas, St. Bernard, and all the holy fathers and doctors, even down to our age from the apostles' times, with the other holy saints, most illustrious and eminent for sanctity and divine miracles that suffered in the dreadful and bloody persecutions;—all those, 1 say, must pass with you for apples of Sodom, bitter as gall and wormwood!

The church of Rome, and all those christian churches, nations and people, that are and have been of her communion since St. Peter's time to this our present pope, Innocent the twelfth, must, in your judgment, neither be, nor represent the catholic church, nor so much as one christian church, though never so small, since the apostles' days, but be all apples of Sodom, bitter as gall and wormwood. And what does all this mean, but that you do not take them for christians? Pray tell me, Mr. Ritschel, what people, and what churches, excepting those named in the tree of life, you account for christians and christian churches, between the time of the apostles' days and your pretended reformation? Give me some notion or representation of the catholic church for one thousand five hundred years before your pretended reformation, excepting, I say, the representation I have given it in the tree of life.

You have granted often enough, in your letters, that God has had a true church in all ages, and

as often you have affirmed that you protestants have held communion with it in all ages, not only before, but since the coming of Christ. Now seeing you deny the church represented in the tree of life to be so much as a christian church, much more that true church of God you speak of as having been in all ages since the coming of Christ, you are hereby obliged to shew us some other church for catholic and christian, which you take for that true church of God, with which you have held communion in all ages, from the coming of Christ to this day: but, to do this is as impossible as to shew us another God. Be your own judge then, Mr Ritschel, whether your denial of the visible church specified in the tree of life to be either the catholic church, or so much as a christian church, be not an evident demonstration of your infidelity.

But, you must pretend a reason for what you do; and the wise one you give, why you cannot find the catholic church in the tree of life, is this; "for I can no more understand your notion of it, viz. how the true notion of catholic, as it denotes the whole church, should agree to one single person, and the pope to be the catholic church, than I can comprehend your doctrine of transubstantiation, which contradicts both my reason and senses." This, Sir, is as pleasant a piece as ever you wrote, and discovers your force of reason and strength of senses, no less than if you had told us you are void of both. Where were your senses, when, searching and examining the tree of life from top to bottom, as you say, you found but one single person, a pope, in it? Could not your senses, at least that of seeing, inform you of more than one pope in the whole line of succession there put down? and could not you, by your sense of seeing, or if that failed you, by your sense of hearing your mother read it, discover more than

one only single person among all the general, national, and provincial councils, fathers, doctors, saints, martyrs, and christian nations that are written down in the tree of life? No; only one single person, a pope, is all I, George Ritschel, could, by all the senses I had, discover in it. Well, Sir, you must not take it ill, then, if I never style you a man of sense, but rather, a man of nonsense.

Let us now examine your stock of reason. How one single person, a pope, can be the whole catholie church you cannot understand, you say: and I also say, neither can I understand it. Nor do I think that ever any man in the world was ever so void of reason, as either to assert, or once to imagine, such a nonsensical paradox: so that your not understanding your vain whim is no argument of your defect of reason: but, that you should thus foolishly fancy that the tree of life pretends one single person, a pope, to be the whole catholic church, is too evident a sign that your reason, if transfused into the brains of your horse, would not make it one jot the better. If we examine your reason and senses any further, we shall find them destroy your faith too: "and then, God knows what a sad case you are in!"

The doctrine of transubstantiation you cannot comprehend by your reason and senses, and therefore you cannot believe it. By this reasoning you must disbelieve all the articles of the christian faith. Can you by your reason and senses comprehend how God is one in three and three in one? How the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost God, and yet not three Gods, but one God? Can your reason inform you how all those three distinct persons can be but one and the same substance? Can your reason comprehend how the Father could beget the Son, and yet the Father not be before the Son, nor the Son be young-

er than the Father, but both without beginning? Can your senses and reason comprehend eternity, without beginning and without end, or immensity, without limits or bounds? Can you, by your senses and reason, conceive how God could become man? How a virgin should bring forth a child? How our bodies shall rise again at the last day, after they have been thousands of years turned to dust, or eaten up by wild beasts, fishes or worms, or burnt to ashes? &c. Can your reason and senses inform you how man, who is made in should live for eternity? These and the other mysteries of faith are as much above the reach of your senses and human reason as the doctrine of transubstantiation; and if you will not believe this, because it is a mystery, which your reason and senses cannot comprehend, so neither can you believe those by the same reason. Where then is your faith? No where at all. Your senses and reason have eaten it up, and brought you to atheism and infidelity.

CHAPTER V.

THE ACCOUNT YOU GIVE OF YOUR FAITH EXAMINED,
TOGETHER WITH YOUR REASON FOR REJECTING
POPE PIUS'S PROFESSION OF FAITH.

THOUGH what you have here said gives just cause to accuse you of infidelity, yet, to do all the fair play that I can, I will further examine, what account you give of your faith in several other places of your writings: as much as can be made appear, so much will I own you to have: for, believe me, my design is not in the least to lessen your faith, nor is it pleasant to me to find you thus destroying it yourself. My endeavour is, that your faith may become perfect, entire, and inviolate, that is, the same in all points with the holy catholic church: for, if it is not such, it is, in effect, no faith all. Let us then see what account you give of it.

"If you desire an account of our faith," say you, "we believe all the articles in the apostles' creed, and those explanations of it given by the first council of Nice and St. Athanasius, because they are contained in scripture: for which reason, we reject that new creed made by pope Pius the fourth, in the council of Trent, because the several articles of it, as the doctrine of purgatory, invocation of saints, indulgences, &c. are not contained in the scripture, nor were ever known or received by

the primitive church."

The reason that you give for believing the creeds is this, because you find, you say, every article of them contained in scripture, that is to say, you believe upon the authority of the scripture, as by you expounded, not upon the authority of the catholic church, expounding the scripture, and declaring her faith in the creeds. Now, this belief

of yours, thus grounded upon your own private sense of scripture, amounts to no more than mere private opinion, at most human faith, and cannot be held for divine faith, because not grounded upon divine authority; no private sense or interpretation of scripture contrary to that of the catholic church being of divine authority. Nor can you ascertain to us your private sense of scripture (when contrary to the sense of the church) to be the divine meaning and sense of the Holy Ghost, in which the scripture ought of necessity to be taken. Your pretended belief of the three creeds is therefore no faith at all.

As to the several articles extracted out of the council of Trent by pope Pius the fourth, as the pope's supremacy, the real presence, purgatory, invocation of saints, &c. you reject them, and for no other reason, it seems, but because you find them not contained in scripture; that is, as you interpret the scripture in your own private sense. But this is no argument, either that they are not to be believed, or that they are not contained in scripture, in the sense of the catholic church, and as by her expounded; for in scripture, according to the interpretation of the catholic church, they are all to be found. By your argument, if the the scripture had never been written, the church had not been obliged to the belief of any one article of faith, contained either in the apostles' or any other creed of the church. As to the several creeds of the church, you must know, that the apostles' creed is but a short summary of the christian faith, not containing every article thereof in express terms, but, in that one sarticle thereof, which teaches us to believe the holy eatholic church, it includes and comprehends all other articles and points of christianity whatsoever, that God has, at any time, revealed to his church. So that, whatsoever the holy catholic church proposes to us to be believed as of faith, we are obliged, by the said article of the apostles' creed, to believe and embrace it for an article of faith divinely revealed to the church, or else, by disbelieving it we disbelieve

the holy catholic church that proposes it.

Now, when heretics rise up against points of faith, not found in the apostles' ereed, nor any of the other creeds of the church, it was on such occasions that the church should declare her faith concerning such points as the hereties called in question and opposed. This she frequently did, by enlarging her professions of faith, and declaring in her councils, what her faith was concerning the points in question, thus signifying her aversion and detestation of the contrary heresy. For instance, when Arius, the heretic, broached his errors against the Son of God and the procession of the Holy Ghost, the catholic church made the Nicene creed, approved the creed of St. Athanasius, for her professions of faith and larger symbols of her belief concerning the points then opposed by the Arian heretics, pressed the words trinity and consubstantiality, to distinguish the catholic believers from heretics. I do not mean that the church made any articles of faith in that council, nor by those words perhaps formerly not used, but she only in more express terms declared her former faith concerning the points opposed.

In like manner, when Berengarius began his heresy against the real presence, the church declared her faith concerning the change of the substance of the bread and wine into the substance of the body and blood of Christ: and this she did by the word transubstantiation. As before she had done the mystery of the three divine persons and three being of one substance, by the words trinity and consubstantiality, so likewise when Luther, Calvin, and other heretics of that age, impugned so many points of eatholic faith, as the pope's

supremacy, the real presence, prayer to saints, purgatory, sacraments, &c. it was necessary that the church, in the council of Trent, as she had done in the council of Nice, should enlarge her former professions of faith, not by making new articles of faith, any more than she did in the Nicene and Athanasian creeds, but declaring in this larger symbol (pope Pius's profession of faith) her ancient faith received by tradition from the apostles, and contained in that article of the apostles' creed. I believe in the holy catholic church. To say, therefore, that pope Pius the fourth made a new creed. or new articles of faith, is as gross a calumny, and as false, as to say, that St. Athanasius and the council of Nice made new creeds, or new articles of faith. So if, in after ages, other strange heretics should arise, never before heard of, it would be necessary that the church, by a further explanation or yet larger profession, should assert and declare her faith in contradiction to new broached heresies. By this means, truth is known from error and falsehood, catholics secured and established in their faith, and heresies cast out and condemned.

You would gladly have your unlearned readers believe that those articles you reject in pope Pius's creed are new, and were never held in the church before the council of Trent. But in this you contradict yourself, Mr. R, and what you have written in other places of your book: for, in page 147, you signify that the pope's supremacy, which you call the usurpation of the bishop of Rome, was held in the year 1600: and, that purgatory, mass, worship of saints, praying for the dead &c. you say, page 140, were opposed by Peter Waldo in the year 1160. Now tell me, Sir, how those doctrines could have been opposed so many hundred years before the Waldenses, yea, by those old heretics who lived before the time of St. Au-

gustine; (as I have shewn before that several of them were) how I say could heretics have oppugned them twelve hundred years before the council of Trent, if they had been so new as to have been instituted by that council or by pope Pius, as you would maliciously and foolishly insinuate. sort of men stand in need of good memories, and I take you for one of those Mr. R. St. Augustine, St. Irenæus, St. Epiphanius, St. Jerom, and other holv fathers, in the primitive church, would never have condemned Arius, Jovinian, Ætius, Vigilantius &c. for denying purgatory, prayer and sacrifices for the dead, invocation and honour of saints, relics of the saints, the fasts of the church &c. if these had not been the doctrines of the church in their times. In short, there is not one point of faith in pope Pius's profession, nor proposed by the council of Trent, but what has been held by the holy fathers in the church ever since the apostles' days, as you may see in their writings collected by Jodocus Coccius, in his Theausurus Catholicus, and in Gaulterus's Tabulæ Chronologicæ, as also, in your protestant Magdeburgian Centurists themselves, who blaspemously accuse St. Augustine, St. Cyprian, St. Jerom, and other primitive fathers of errors for holding them. Yet you, bold scribbler, have the confidence to tell us, they were never known, nor received by the primitive church.

The apostles' creed, the Nicene and Athanasian creeds you could not believe, it seems, unless you find every point of faith in them contained in the scripture. I pray you, learned scripturist, shew me texts out of scripture for every point of faith contained in the Athanasian creed. Have you clearer scripture for the trinity and consubstantiality, than you have for the eucharist being the true body and blood of Christ? If you have, pray produce them. I say the same of other articles of faith contained in pope Pius's creed. Let me see

what clearer texts of scripture you can bring against an Arian, in proof of the trinity, and consubstatiality, than are to be found against you in defence of St. Peter's and his successors' supremacy, the real presence, purgatory, prayer for the dead, prayer for saints, seven sacraments &c.? Where are your scripture proofs, against an anabaptist, in defence of infant baptism? Against a sabbatarian, in defence of keeping the first day of the week holy? Against such as hold it unlawful to eat things strangled and blood, in defence of the contrary tenet and practice.

It is the eath lie church, Mr. Ritschel, that only can ascertain to us what is of divine revelation. We, her members, therefore undoubtedly believe whatever she proposes to us for matter of faith, whether she delivers it in her creeds, in her councils, by oral traditions, and her universal practice, or in the sacred scriptures as expounded by her. Thus, keeping close to the church's traditions, our faith is catholic, and we hold it entire

and inviolable.

You heretics, on the contrary, relying only on your own private interpretation, can have no certainty for your faith; more than any particular man of you can affirm that he is unerring or infallible. Your pretence, therefore, as is said, to the creeds as taking them only upon your own private exposition of scripture, and believing them no further than you can, in your private sense, prove them out of scripture, can be no evidence of your faith being any more than mere human opinion, not divine, or catholic faith. And this you wisely foresaw would be all you could come to by your pretence of admitting and rejecting the church's creeds, upon the ground of their doctrines being contained or not contained in scripture, interpreted by you not by the church : and, therefore, you proceed further in the account of your faith,

pretending to lay hold of the catholic church's authority for it, well knowing that, if you could secure this, you would be secure enough. And

thus you go on.

"We also believe that there is but one, holy, catholic and apostolical church, because Christ has but one body: and we also hold the faith of this one, holy, catholic and apostolic church, and that, in every point thereof, whole and inviolate: and we are also members of this one, holy, catholic and apostolic church, as I have sufficiently proved already." This, Sir, were something if it were true. But, the mischief is, you cannot make good what you so boldly assert. Nor is it true that you have ever yet proved, or ever can prove, any such thing, as is shewn you above.

That there is but one holy, catholic and apostolic church, I am glad you grant. How she can be one, holy, catholic and apostolic, and yet corrupted in faith, and ulcerated with errors from head to foot, as you so often affirm and so labour to prove, though in vain, I cannot imagine. Nor is it possible that corruptions and errors in faith can consist with unity, sanctity &c. so that, by this happy grant, you have ruined and utterly destroyed all your arguments and blasphemous nonsense of the catholic church being corrupt in

faith.

But tell me, Sir, where is this one, holy, catholic and apostolic church, that you are members of, and whose faith you hold entire and inviolable in every point? The church of Rome you deny to be it, your own church of England you deny to be it, the Greek church you dare not pretend to be it, nor the Armenians, nor the Nestorians, nor Russians, nor any one protestant church in all the whole protestant reformation, because your church of England agrees in faith with none of these. Where, then, is this one, holy, catholic and apos-

tolic church, whose faith you hold entire and inviolate? It is too difficult a point for you, denying the church of Rome to be it, and papists (as you call us) members of it, to determine which it is, or where it is; and, if you cannot do this, it is impossible you can prove that your church of England agrees with it, and holds every point of its faith whole and undefiled. What greater absurdity and deeper nonsense could you have been guilty of, than thus ridiculously to afarm, that you hold the faith of the holy catholic church whole and inviolate in every point thereof, when you deny your own church of England to be it, and cannot so much as find one church or any church in the whole world, that you either can take for it, or with whom you can agree in faith?

All this mighty pretence, you see, leaves you as void of eatholic faith, and as far from being a member of the one, holy, and apostolic church, as if you had only pretended to have held the faith of the quakers, and have been a member of that

heathenish body.

Suppose, Sir, you could possibly meet with a church with which your church of England agreed in every point of faith; yet, seeing you hold her fallible and that she may err in matters of faith, you can still have no grounds to believe, that either she or your own church holds the catholic faith whole and inviolate, and, therefore, will find it as difficult to prove that her or your faith is true and entire, as you do at present.

That tenet of the church's infallibility was an unlucky shelf, whereon your first pretended reformers were obliged to split. But, then, it was inevitable; for, if they had not held the church fallible, they could have had no pretence for reforming her. This brought them and all their followers under a necessity of holding their own church of England fallible; for they could not

attribute to her, a particular, what they denied to the universal church. The church of England, then, being, by her own confession, fallible, she cannot, upon her own authority, evidence any one article of faith for an infallible truth; because she cannot evidence the veracity of her authority. He therefore, who assents to any one point of faith, by her, (upon her authority) proposed, must needs act contrary to a rational soul, in believing or truth what may be actually false, for any thing she, the proposer, knows to the contrary.

Neither can she, without the greatest imprudence imaginable, pretend to oblige rational men to assent, upon her authority, either to any one article of faith, or to the sense she gives to the scripture by her interpreted, since, if she knows that she is fallible and may be in the wrong, she can have no evidence that she is in the right, or that she is not actually deceived in what she proposes. Hence it follows, that not only the Roman catholics, but also presbyterians, anababtists, quakers, Socinians, &c. may justly, nay, ought in reason, to refuse their assent to what she proposes to them, contrary to what they hold. Nay, seeing she is fallible, she may possibly be in damnable error, and for any thing she knows, or can evidence to the contrary, actually is in damnable Who, therefore, is the man, that can either in reason, or upon serious consideration, venture his eternal salvation upon this self-owned fallible church?

This brings to my memory that so often repeated sentence of yours, viz. "that you protestants of the church of England are as true catholics as ever lived upon the face of the earth." Considering your owning the church to have continued in her virgin purity for the first four hundred or six hundred years, and considering your tenet of your church's fallibility, this is the boldest expression I

ever met with. If you would not except those holy fathers who lived in the time you allow the church to have continued a pure virgin and undefiled (as you express it) yet you might, in good manners, have excepted the twelve apostles, whom you own to have been infallible. But you (though fallible) have the presumption to affirm without exception of either primitive fathers, apostles, or evangelists, "that you are as true catholics as ever lived upon the face of the earth!" Never let this shameless piece appear hereafter in your writings, at least, while you own your church to be fallible. For certainly, nothing can be more ridiculously impudent than for you to pretend to be " as true catholics as ever lived upon the face of the earth," when by your doctrine of fallibility, you disable yourselves from evidencing your being catholics at all; yea, from having any certainty of the truth of any one point of faith you hold, upon your fallible church's authority.

CHAPTER VI.

WHETHER THE MARKS OF GOD'S CHURCH, BY WHICH SHE IS NOTED IN THE APOSTLES' AND NICENE CREEDS, CAN PROPERLY BE APPLIED TO, OR AGREE WITH THE PROTESTANT CHURCH OF ENGLAND?

THE holy apostles, and the fathers in the Nicene council have given us certain marks and notes of God's church, whereby she may be known and distinguished from all schismatical congregations whatever. The apostles' creed gives her the characters of holy and catholic, the Nicene creed, one, holy, catholic and apostolic. My consideration, therefore, shall be, whether these four notes of unity, sanctity, universality, and apostolical succession belong to the church of England, or, to all other protestant congregations together, if you please; for what I shall say of her may in general be applied to the whole body of protestants, or to any one particular sect of them.

Unity.

To seek for this character of unity among protestants in general, is to loose our labour; for the world knows that the Lutherans in Germany refuse communion with the Zuinglians and Calvinists of Switzerland and Geneva, and they with them; and both with the church of England, and she with them; every one of them damning one another for heretics. So, in England, neither is there any communion or unity among presbyterians, anababtists, quakers, Socinians, and episcopal protestants, &c. one party in England worrying the other by penal laws; another sort in Scotland kicking out the rest for limbs of antichrist; every sort gathering themselves together into separate herds. See more of this above. And, as to your church of England alone, she is so far from agree-

ing with herself, as cuts off all pretence to unity. How often she has changed and altered her liturgy and articles may be seen above. How she has held and denied the real presence her writers one against another can witness. You will find what work was made about altars, priests, sacrifice, and the real presence in the days of king Charles the first, if you please to read Dr. Pocklington's Altare Christianum, The coal from the altar, The quench coal, The vicar of Grantham, The dead vicar's plea, Laddensium autacachrysis, and the common prayer book sent by the king and the archbishop Laud into Scotland. See also Prin, Bastwick, Knewstubbs, Survey of the holy discipline, Persecutio, A discourse of liturgies, The holy table, Name and thing, Gangrena, &c. If you were to begin at the first common prayer book, and come down from it to the second; then to the forty-two articles, then to the history of the troubles of Frankfort, &c. and so on down to the writings against one another, since the reformation to the schism between Sancroft and Tillotson, and their parties, to the Scotch presbyterian eloquence, and its answer to their writings one against another, for and against the trinity; to Hichringil's Ceremony-monger, and the bishop of Sarum's exposition of the thirty-nine articles; if, I say, you were to examine your church's writers and their doctrines, from its beginning to this day, you would certainly believe that greater Babylonical confusion plagued this pretended church of yours, than ever fell upon any one sort of heretics, since the days of Simon Magus.

As to your present confession of faith, the thirty-nine articles, not any two persons, since they were made, ever yet agreed in what sense to take them. For instance of their differences, even in that one article of Christ's descent into hell, they have been of so many minds, that, at

last, your whole church is forced to own, in Mr. Rogers, that she is ignorant what it means. "She knows not the native and undoubted sense of it." And Dr. Burnet puts three different senses on it, and gives liberty to every man to take it in which of them he pleases. He does the same in the article of predestination, yet himself holds none of the three. Compare Burnet and Rogers together, and see the difference. Concerning the eleventh article, that faith alone justifies, compare Rogers, The practice of piety, and Dr. Shelford's, Three sermons on faith, hope and charity together, and see how they agree. Consider your church's doctrine of confession and absolution, in the common prayer book, and see if you find many in your whole congregation that believe it. If you, parson, should preach to the people that they ought to come and confess their sins to you, and that you have power and authority to forgive them their sins, and to absolve them from all their iniquities, though voa should produce both the common prayer book, and forms of your ordination in proof of it, yet there would not be one in a thousand but would rather laugh at you than believe you. If you think it is not true, pray make trial of it in two or three of your next sermons. Dr. Pocklington having largely defended the doctrine of absolution and penance, concludes thus. "I know this whole discourse touching penance is not pleasing:" and you will find his words true, if ever you dare publicly assert the doctrine.

Neither do the protestants agree about the number, necessity and efficacy of the sacraments. In the Lutheran confession of Augsburgh presented to the Emperor Charles the fifth, anno 1530, they hold three sacraments, baptism, the eucharist, and penance. Melanethon added the sacrament of orders to those three, and so held four. In Lipsia they have three, in Wittenburg four, at

Magdeburg Illyricus and his companions owned but two: the Zwenkfieldians were for none at all. Cranmer held penance a sacrament, your bishop Bramhall grants orders to be a sacrament; Mr. Rogers denies both these to be sacraments, and teaches that baptism is not necessary to salvation, and that original sin remains after baptism.

Nor is there an union in their government, some holding as many heads of their church as there are presbyters, some as many heads as bishops; some a subordination of presbyters under their diocesan bishops, and of diocesan bishops under the archbishops, and of archbishops under the primate. Here some have a mind to stop, but others are for having the temporal prince, or laymagistrate, whether man, woman, or child, to be at the head of the church. This is the doctrine of the loyal part of the church of England, but disowned by all other sorts of protestants. Many other irreconcileable differences I could shew you. but these, with what already has been said in several places above, are sufficient to shew that protestants want the mark of Christ's church, unity.

Sanctity.

This mark of Christ's church is as visible among protestants as their religion was for fifteen hundred years together, before Luther. A holy priesthood they cannot be imagined to have, because they want, not only apostolical succession and lawful mission, but even ordination itself, as you know all the protestants beyond seas, and those in Scotland and England, which are not of your episcopal communion, want in very deed. Witness your pretended bishops reordaining them, as is above said. Consequently they have neither true sacraments, nor lawful preaching among them, as you may see in their complaint quoted above.

The same may be said of your protestant church of England's priesthood: for it cannot be that you, who, as is clearly proved by the author of Erastus Senior, have had no valid form of ordination from the time of your abolishing the catholic ordinal in king Edward the sixth's time, till the year 1662, can have either priest or bishop in your pretended church. Besides the nullity and invalidity of that vain and insignificant form of ordination, devised, as its title says, by king Edward the sixth, your first pretended bishop, Matthew Parker, could never get any catholic bishop to consecrate him; so that all the consecration, poor man, he could get was given him in the Nag'shead tavern in Cheapside by John Scory, a priest only, and no bishop, as Dr. Champney and the author of the Nullity of the English clergy have made appear in their writings; nay, admitting your pretended Lambeth Register to be true (as, on the contrary, it is a for ged thing, as is apparent in the said two authors) yet Barlow, who is by that register said to have consecrated Parker, was neverb ishop himself, as I have told you above, and could not, therefore, make Parker a bishop; and Parker being no bishop, neither can any in your church have that character, because they all depend upon him. But, if your ordination and consecration were good and valid, yet you want lawful mission, and therefore are not shepherds of the flock, but only such as Jeremias the prophet says run unsent, such as St. John, chap. 10 tells us, enter not by the door but climb up some other way, and are theires and robbers. And what sanctity, I pray, can be expected in such a pretended priesthood, as has neither character, nor mission? What sign of sanetity can there be in those congregations, that have neither bishops, priests, mission, sacraments, nor lawful preaching? Your abolishing the christian sacrifice, accounting it a blasphemous fable, your doctrine of concupiscence being sin, of every, even the least, sin being mortal, of the impossibility of keeping the commandments, of faith alone justifying, your easting away five of the seven sacraments, your banishing Christ's presence from the eucharist, and taking away the absolute necessity of baptism, all which is done by your protestant church in Rogers, these, I say, are so far from being signs of sanctity, that they denote quite the contrary.

Consider, besides all this, the abominably wicked and most infamous lives of your first protestant pretended reformers, and tell me what sign of sanctity you find find in them. By their fruits you shall know them &c. Matt. chap. 7.

Martin Luther, who was the first protestant gospeller, as he himself in Epistola ad Argentineses, boasts; and who (as the Tigurine protestants in confessione Germanica edit: Tiguri anno 1544 say) brags of himself, "to be the prophet and apostle of the Germans, who learned of no man, and of whom all others have learned &c."; this first father and grandsire of protestancy, owns that he had the devil for his instructor, who, in a sensible conference with him, taught him arguments against the mass. "It chanced," says he, "that, upon a certain time." I suddenly awoke about midnight: then satan began his disputation with me saying; "hearken right learned doctor Luther, thou hast celebrated mass during these fifteen years" &c. And so the devil going on with arguments, which he himself there at large sets down, dissuaded him from saying mass any longer. See Luther's own works, Tom. 7 Wittemb: fol: 228. Anno 1588. Lib. de missa privata fol. 443, et To: b: Germ: Jenensi fol: 28. in lib. de missa angulari. And Manlius, his scholar, in loc: com: testifies of him this, and

many other his familiarities with the devil. So

does Brerely in Apol: and life of Luther. Many of his damnable heresies you have seen above. He also taught, as he owns in his book De concilus, page 2, that "the divinity of Christ suffered." And he says in Confess, majore de cæna domini; "if only the human nature suffered for us, Christ is a saviour of vile and small account, and stands in need himself, also, of a saviour." In Tom 3, Wittemb. in Psal. 26 fol. 279, he taught that "Christ descended into hell, there also to suffer torments in soul after his death." He taught that "the divinity is threefold even as the three persons." He blotted out of his litanies this verse, Holy trinity, one God, have mercy on us, affirming that "the word trinity is but a human invention, and sounds coldly"; and that "his soul hates the word homousion." out of his Dutch bibles that text of scripture where St. John, 1st. epistle, chap. 5, says, "there are three which bear testimony in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one." See Enchirid. printed anno 1543, Postel, Brerely, Cnoglerus in Symb. tria, Ulembay in Gratia et Just. Con. edit. 1589. Dr. Burnet also discredits this text. Luther makes God the author of sin, saving, "how can man prepare himself to good, seeing it is not in his power to make his ways evil, for God worketh the wicked work in the wicked." See Brerely, tract 2, and the first editions of Luther's own works printed at Wittemberg, and in edit. Basil 1521. His detestable pride in contemning the ancient fathers, and even the apostles themselves, is intolerable. "The gospel," says he, "is so copiously preached by as, that, truly, in the apostles' time it was not so clear." "I certainly know that neither Augustine nor Ambrose are equal to me. The fa-

thers of so many ages have been plainly blind

and most ignorant in the scriptures, and have erred all their life-time, and, unless they were amended at their deaths, they were neither saints, nor pertaining to the church." See Knot's Protestancy condemned, and Brerely. "In the writings of Jerom there is not a word of true faith, Christ, and sound religion. Tertullian is very superstitious; I have holden Origen long since accursed. Of Chrysostom I make no account. Basil is of no worth; he is wholly a monk; I weigh him not a hair. Cyprian is a weak divine," &c. "Be it so that the church, Augustine, and other doctors, also Peter, Apollo, yea, an angel from heaven teach otherwise, yet, my doctrine is such, that it sets forth God's glory," &c. "Peter, the chief of the apostles, did live and teach, besides the word of God, (extra verbum Dei)" not, if a thousand Augustines, a thousand Cyprians," &c. "stand against me. If Cyprian, Ambrose, Augustine, Peter, Paul, yea, an angel from heaven teach otherwise, notwithstanding, I certainly know that what I teach is not human but divine." You may see all these sayings of his extracted out of his own works by Brerely, and the author of Protestancy condemned. Or, if you have a mind to examine his works, see lib. ad. Ducem Georgium Collog. lat. Ad Gallatas c. 1, tom. 2, tom. 5, tom. 7, edit Wittemb. Lib. de servo, arbitrio. Col. mensal, lib. contra Regem Angli, &c. His filthy and unclean doctrines may be found dispersed over all his works. thing," says he, "is more sweet or loving upon earth, than the love of a woman, if a man can obtain it." In Prov. 31. marg. "I am burnt," says he, "with the great flame of my untamed flesh." Tom 1, ep. lat. fol. 334. He owns himself to have been almost mad through the rage of lust. Col. mensal. He was so hasty in his sacrilegious marriage with Catharine Boren, an

apostate nun, that he could not stay till the next day, but married in the night. Melancthon ep ad Joac. Camer: In con. evang. He affirms, that polygamy is no more abrogated than the rest of Moses' law, and that it is free, as being neither commanded nor forbidden. Tom. 5, Wittemb. fol. 122, and in Explie. Geneseos edit, 1525, and Brerely. "If the wife will not, or cannot come, says he, let the maid come." Brerely. The Magistrates' duty is to bridle the wife, yea, to put her to death; which, if the magistrates omit, the husband is to imagine his wife to be stolen away by thieves, and dead, and consider how to marry another." Sermon de Matrimonio, Tom 5, Wit. He was an excessive drinker, in so much that in Germany to this day, they have this proverb, Bibamus Lutheranice, that is, let us drink Luther like. His doctrine of faith alone justifying, gave him liberty for all sorts of vice. "It sufficeth," says he, "that we know the riches of the glory of God, the lamb which takes away the sins of the world; from him sin cannot draw us, though we commit fornication or murder a thousand times in one day;" ep. ad. Phil. fol. 334 and 335. He calls it impiety to affirm, that faith justifies not without charity, in Galatas, c. 2; and says farther, "unless faith be without even the least good works it does not justify, may, it is not faith;" tom. 1, prop. 3. "A christian, or one baptised, is so rich that, though he would, he could not lose his salvation by any sin though never so great, unless he will not believe;" tom. 2, Wittemb. de captiv. Bab. And in the same place, class 5. Pastel Ger. part 2, anno 1537, he says, "no sin is so great as can condemn a man, for only infidelity condemns all even who are damned; and, on the contrary, only faith makes all men blessed." This is your protestant apostle, Mr. Ritschel, the most glorious of your reformers; this is he whom your master,

John Jewel, styles "a man sent from God to enlighten the world," and whom your martyrologer styles "the Elias, conductor and chariot of Israel, to be reverenced next after Christ and Paul: Acts and monuments; and Gabriel Powel canonizes him by the name of "holy saint Luther." If such be your saints, God bless us from your sinners.

John Calvin was another of your infamous reformers. His doctrines may be seen above. His delicacy in diet, his pride, his writing letters in his own praise under the name of Galasius and others, and sending them to Peter Visesius, minnister of Lausanna, to be by him dispersed abroad, his incontinency and abominable lusts, his seditious doctrines and reproachful words against princes, his bargin with one Bruel and his wife, that this Bruel should feign himself dead, and Calvin, in confirmation of his doctrine and sanctity, should by miracle raise him to life in the presence of many witnesses, which when he attempted, Bruel was by the just judgement of God found dead indeed: upon which his wife exclaimed publicly against Calvin, and discovered the whole imposture, and what money Calvin conditioned to give her husband; these and much more, you may find in Bolsec, who wrote his life, as also in Brerely and Protestancy condemned. As also his adultery with a gentlewoman of Mongis, whom he tempted to steal away from her husband at Lausanna, and make her abode with him at Geneva. endeavoured to tempt to the like wickedness the lady Jollande of Bredrode, wife to James Burgongue, lord of Falaise; so that, through his beastly importunities, she was forced to persuade her husband to leave Geneva and go with her to live at Lausamia, where she revealed the whole matter. It was testified against him by the whole eity of Moven, that he was by the magistrates of that city branded in the shoulder with a hot iron

for sodomy. This was notified against him by the said city to Monsieur Bertlier, secretary of Geneva, under the hand of a public notary. A brave

protestant saint!

Zuinglius, another holy reformer, for his impious doctrines, as that baptism is not necessary, but a thing indifferent; that God is the author of sin; that heathers may be saved &c. comes equally up with the two former: nor is he much short of them in his unchaste and filthy desires of the flesh, as may be seen in what he wrote to the Helvetian republic. "The lustful desires of the flesh," says he, "to burn in us we cannot deny, seeing that by means thereof we are rendered infamous before the congregation. We know by experience that the weakness of our flesh has often been the cause of our falling. This and much more he and his followers wrote for reasons to the Helvetians, to grant them licence, being priests, to marry. And in another epistle to the bishop of constance, anno 1522, he Fabritius, Leo, Jude, and eight or nine others, whose names were all subscribed, cry out for wives, saying "we have burned so hotly that we have committed many unhandsome and unseemly things." Thus were they perpetually possessed by the unclean spirit of fornication. See Brerely.

John Knox began his reformation in Scotland with the confessed murder of the cardinal of St. Andrews, in his bed chamber, as also with actual rebellion against Queen Mary of Scotland, who, through his and his reformers means, was at last banished out of her kingdom into England, where queen Elizabeth most inhumanly imprisoned her fifteen years together, and then barbarously cut off her head, not allowing her to have her confessor by her at her death. He published treasonable and seditious writings, affirming, that "princes may be deposed, if they become tyrants, and act

against God and his truth," (meaning his pretended true religion) saying also that "it were very good that rewards were publicly appointed by the people for such as kill tyrants, (as he calls catholic princes) as well as for those who kill other beasts of prey." These and such like were the impious and detestable doctrines of John Knox and other pretended reformers, who persisted in them. He and other authors of the pretended reformation led wicked lives and died miserable deaths. King Harry the eighth, as Sanders writes in his book De Schismate, Anglicano, sent out his last breath in these desperate words: "Perdidimus omnia," "we have lost all."

Anna Boleyn, the cause of King Harry's departure from his own queen and schism from the church, was by the said king, her unlawful hust band, beheaded for incest with her own brother, the Lord Rochford, and adultery with other three:

Thomas Cromwell, king Harry's great agent in pulling down religious houses, abbeys, monasteries and nunneries, died by the hand of the executioner for treason, in the height of his greatness, condemned by king Harry, his master.

The Lord Seymour, duke of Somerset, the chief actor in king Edward the sixth's days in bringing in protestancy, was by order of his nephew, the young king, beheaded for a traitor. So was also Sir. Thomas Seymour, his brother. All this and much more of others may be seen in the protestant historians of this nation.

The earl of Murray, Knox's chief aider in settling protestancy in Scotland, died in the height of his triumphs for his sister's blood by a pistol bullet shot at him by one of the Hammiltons, in revenge of a mischief formerly done him by the said Murray. Of John Knox king James the first said, "God in his justice set a visible mark at his going out the world." He, being in his sickness, called

for drink, which the maid that then waited with him going down to fetch, she found him at her return pulled out of bed by the devil, and laid dead on the floor, with a most horrid, frightful, and ghastly countenance, the candle and fire totally extinct, and a most ugly, thick, and stinking darkness in the room. This you may find in Knott's

Protestancy condemned.

Let any rational man consider whether those "glorious reformers," as you call them, were like missioners sent from God, or apostolical men authorised and sent by Christ, or the Holy Ghost's inspiration, to plant the faith of Christ or reform his holy catholic church. Consider, further, that those first protestants, Luther, Calvin, Cranmer &c. were in their faiths different from one another; the Lutherans condemning the Zuinglians and Calvinists for heretics, these as deeply cursing them. As to the lives and manners of their followers, especially the pretended bishops clergy of the church of England, they have ever since the pretended reformation been too notorious, and, at this day, are too well known to be taken for saints, or their lives for signs of sanctity. But this I press not for an argument of their church's want of sanctity, so much as I do that of their first beginners. For, if God almighty had any way testified the sanctity and truth of their religion at its beginning, it is not the immoralities, vices or bad examples of wicked men, though in the highest ecclesiastical dignity or office in it, could have rendered the religion itself, if otherwise true and holy, false or impious.

But, I say, for the very first broachers and beginners of a new religion, as Luther was of his, Cranmer of his, Calvin of his, to be men of the most abominable, wicked, and most scandalously infamous lives; yea, and so hated by God, as to be struck to death like Julian, the apostate, or Herod by the revenging hand of divine justice; for such beginners of religion, I say, to be such men, is an evident sign and sufficient argument, that neither themselves are called and sent by God, nor inspired by his holy spirit, and consequently, that the new faith or religion they pretend to introduce and establish, is neither true, holy, or what God has appointed for the world to follow and believe.

God never sent either prophet or apostle with any extraordinary commission, but he testified their mission and doctrine to be from him by the grace of holy lives, and the divine gift of supernatural works and miracles, as is evident in Moses and the prophets, in the apostles, and all those apostolical men, that in several ages have converted the nations of the earth to christianity. even those whom God appointed to begin religious orders and yet more extraordinary ways of pious living in his church, he always endued with extraordinary virtues, sanctity and gift of divine miracles, as his seal and testificate, whereby the world might know their commission, and what they established was from him. But, as from the several sorts of protestants, neither in their beginning were they by God attested for true prophets, neither by sanctity or the gift of miracles, nor has there ever been any one saint, that they can name, of any of their religions to this day. All which considered, there need be no more said in evidence, that protestants want this note of Christ's church, sanetitu.

Universality.

There needs not much to be said to this, for, I think, neither all the protestants together, much less any one sect of them, will, upon serious consideration, pretend to it. Before the year 1517 there was not any one sort of them in being in any age, or in any one place in the whole world, as it is evident from their never being able to

name one before Martin Luther. As to the church of England and that sort in communion with it, they can pretend to deduce their pedigree no higher than Cranmer,-I should rather say Parker; and they know very well, that, in the beginning of king Harry the eighth's reign, the whole nation was catholics, and protestants were unheard of in it, or in any other part of the world: nor does this pretended church, at this day, extend any further than the dominions of the king of England, nor scarce are half of them of its communion. It is, then, impossible that it should be universal. Neither is there any communion, either in faith, worship, ceremonies, or government, between it and any other church, whether protestant, catholic, or schismatic, in the whole world, that they know or can name, as is shewn above. Besides, there is neither any of your English protestant communion, nor any other sort of protestants whatever, who have ever converted any nation in the world to christianity. If there be, name it, and by whom it was made christian. But this you cannot do. that we may say of you, as Tertullian (lib. de præscrip) said of the hereties of his time, "your work is not to convert strangers to Jesus Christ, but to pervert his domestics." But you, Sir, have said enough to your universality already, when you call it a wild and extravagant thing to bid you prove your church the one, holy catholic church; so that, both from your own grant and from what is here said, you have not this mark of Christ's church, universality.

Apostolical succession.

First, as for all those sorts of protestants, who are not of your church of England's communion, your practice of reordaining their ministers, as is said, is an undeniable argument of their wanting apostolical succession, even in your own opinions.

As for your pretended church, if she presumes to pretend herself apostolical, let her shew herself to be so by preducing a list or catalogue of her protestant bishops succeeding one another in an uninterrupted line of succession from some of the apostles to this day. But, this has so often been demanded by catholic writers, that if, there had been any probability of doing it, we should certainly have heard of it, and seen it too, long before this; and without this it is in vain to pretend yourselves apostolic. In short, seeing you had neither bishop, priest, nor professors of your protestant religion before the year 1517, it is impossible your pretended church should be apostolic. Indeed, Sir, you had reason to call it a wild and extravagant fancy to bid you prove your church the one, holy, catholic and apostolic church, and to declare you should not trouble yourself to give it an answer; seeing it is thus undeniably evident, that your church has neither unity, sanctity, universality, nor apostolical succession.

Consider then, Mr. Ritschel, upon what grounds you venture your eternal salvation, while you continue a member of this protestant congregation, or pretended church, that has not so much as one single note, or mark, or character belonging to the church of Christ.

CHAP. VII.

THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH IS THE ONE, HOLY, CATHOLIC AND APOSTOLIC CHURCH.

OBSERVE, in the first place, that the whole and only rule of the catholic faith, to which all are subject under pain of heresy and excommunication, is divine revelation delivered to the prophets and apostles, proposed by the catholic church in her general councils, or by her universal practice, to be believed as an article of catholic faith, the same of which is contained in the apostles' creed, either expressly there set down, or under this article, I believe in the holy catholic church, by which article all christians are obliged to believe whatsoever the holy catholic church delivers and proposes to be believed as matter of faith divinely revealed. Consequently, all are obliged to believe the other creeds of the church, as the Athanasian, Nicene, and Tridentine creeds, in which the several articles of the catholic faith are more expressly declared than in that of the apostles, especially in the Tridentine creed, extracted by pope Pius the fourth out of the council of Trent. All, I say, are obliged to believe the said creeds or professions of faith, because, according to our rule of faith, they are proposed by the catholic church in her general councils and universal practice as articles of faith divinely revealed to be believed.

Whatever is not of this nature and authority, as the opinions of schools, canonists, private doctors, doctrines grounded upon scripture variously interpreted by private men and other disputable matters or private opinions, not being ascertained to us, nor proposed by the church,

though they may be true in themselves, yet are not of obligation to be believed as matters of faith This I give you to understand, that you may know how to distinguish between matters or articles of faith, and private opinions that are but of human authority. Now let us proceed to apply the marks of Christ's church to the church of Rome.

Unity.

This character the church of Rome justly claims. First, as to her faith, all her members throughout the whole world have and believe one and the same faith, even the vulgar and most ignorant, that have not capacities of knowing explicitly, distinctly, and in particular all the several articles of it, do nevertheless assent to and believe in general whatever the church believes. By believing in this manner and disbelieving nothing, the simple, unlearned, and most ignorant have and believe the whole faith as entirely as the most learned that know explicitly and in particular every article thereof. Thus every one believes all, every one believes the same, no one disbelieves what the rest believe, no one believes what the rest What greater unity than this can there be, either in things to be believed, or in the persons believing? The church does not teach one faith in one nation and another faith in another, but the one and the same faith in every part of the world. Nor does she teach, in this age, what was not the faith of the preceding one, but, what she received from the apostles, that she faithfully preserves, and delivers down through every age to posterity. See this proved in Coccins and Gaulterius.

The union of the church of Rome is also as entire in its worship and government as in its faith. As to its worship, it is one and the same through the whole church. One God in Trinity and Trinity in Unity is every where worshipped and ador-

ed. One and the same sacrifice, the precious body and blood of Christ, is daily offered to God the Father in the great christian sacrifice, the mass, through the whole church. The same sacraments. both in number, virtue, and efficacy are in all places duly administered. The church triumphant in heaven is every where honoured by this church on earth: the saints and angels there are invocated and desired to pray to God for us here. They, in like manner, continually offer up their prayers to God for us, the church militant on earth. That part of the church now suffering in purgatory is also daily prayed for to God by the members of this church. Thus, there is a communion among all the members of Christ's church, when ther militant on earth, suffering in purgatory, or, triumphant in heaven. This is the communion of saints, the unity of that mystical body of which Christ is the head.

As to the government of the church of Rome, all its members throughout the world are united together in communion under one and the same priesthood and episcopal government, terminating in one high priest,—the chief bishop; all, both laity, priests, and bishops being united in one subordination of government under the same one, universal, chief bishop, the pope of Rome, the visible head over all the members. Thus, the church of Rome, wherever it is diffused through the whole world, is one visible flock under one visible pastor.

This blessed union the prophet Ezechiel, chap. 37, foretold when, speaking of the unity of Christ's kingdom, his church, he says, I will make them one nation in the land upon the mountains of Israel, and one king shall be king over them all, and they shall be no more two nations, neither shall they be divided into two kingdoms any more at all. And David, my servant, shall be king over them,

and they shall have one shepherd. This prophecy is verified chiefly in Christ himself, who is the one king and shepherd over the whole church militant and triumphant. And, as to the visible church on earth, it alludes also to St. Peter and his successor, who were by Christ himself made chief pastors and feeders of his whole flock in these words, feed my tambs, feed my sheep. For this pastor our Saviour prayed that his faith should

not fail. Luke, 22.

For this flock he also prayed that it might be one, in these words; Holy Futher, keep, through thy own name, those whom thou hast given me, that they may be one as we are one: neither do I pray for these alone, but for them also who shall believe in me through all the world, that they may be all one as thou Father in me, and I in thee, that they may be one in us, that the world may believe that thou hast sent me. And the glory which thou gavest me I have given them that they may be one even as we are one; I in them and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one, and that the world may know that thou hast sent me, and hast loved them as thou hast loved me.

And thus much is sufficient to shew that St. Peter's flock, the church of Rome, has this mark of Christ's church, unity.

Sanctity.

This character of Christ's church justly belongs to the church of Rome, in which is a holy priesthood instituted by Christ himself, the author of all sanctity, from whom it has lawfully descended down to us, conferred by a sacrament in which the grace of the Holy Ghost is given. In this church is a holy sacrifice, the Lamb of God, who takes away the sins of the world, the same that was once offered upon the cross still continued and daily offered upon her altars. In her are holy sacraments instituted by Christ, forgiving sin and

confering grace. Original sin is cleansed by baptism, actual sin by the sacrament of penance. The sacrament of confirmation confers into the souls of her members all the gifts and fruits of the Holy Ghost in a most plentiful manner. Married people are sanctified by the sacrament of marriage. The sick are cleansed, sanctified and prepared for their last end by the sacrament of extreme unction. And by receiving the holy and blessed body and blood of Christ, in the holy eucharist, all the members become one, holy, and sanctified body united to Christ its head.

In this church is a holy faith, testified for such by God himself with divine miracles, taught by the Son of God, and delivered to her by his holy apostles, and by her preserved and taught to all

her members.

The sanctity of the church of Rome is yet further evident from the holy lives of infinite numbers of religious of both sexes, in all parts of the world, who have dedicated themselves to Christ, their spouse, by the three vows of poverty, chastity and obedience. The austere and mortified lives of the religious, their fastings, their watchings, their prayers, their self denials &c. give testimony to their sanctity. And even those who live in the world, in the midst of secular affairs, and under the daily combat against their three enemies, the world, the flesh and the devil, give great testimony of their sanctity by their just, pious and virtuous lives, by their daily resisting temptations of all sorts, by denying themselves and their own corrupt inclinations, their willingly suffering the loss of their goods, estates, imprisonments, and even loss of life for their holy faith and the love of God. Their extraordinary works of charity, their alms-deeds, hospitality, feeding the hungry, clothing the naked, redeeming captives, visiting and assisting the sick, relieving the

fatherless, widows, and oppressed, helping and assisting one another in their necessities, and all this purely for the love of God, give testimony to

the sanctity of this church.

And, lastly, the sanctity of this church is further testified by God himself, in the infinite number of great saints and blessed martyrs, who have, in all ages, beautified her by their pure and holy lives, and whose sanctity God has attested by the many great and stupendous miracles which they

wrought.

Of what church in the world, if not of this, did Go I speak by the prophet Ezechiel, when he saidchapter 37 "I will set my sanctuary in the midst of them for evermore and the heathen sanetuary shall know that I, the Lord, do sanctify Israel, when my sanctuary shall be in the midst of them for ever. For the sanctity of this his flock our Saviour prayed, John, chap. 17, saying, sanctify them through thy truth; thy word is truth. As thou hast sent me into the world, even so I have also sent them into the world, and for their sakes I sanctify myself that they also might be sanctified through thy truth. St. Peter the holy pastor of the church, Ephes. 1 chap. 1, thus exhorts his flock. who has called you is holy, so be ye holy in all manner of conversation, because it is written: be you holy as I am holy. And chap. 2. But you are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation. St. Paul in his 1st. chap. to the Romans tells them: they are called to be saints, and Ephes. 5th. Christ loved the church, says he, and gave himself for it, that he might sanctify and cleanse it with washing of water by the word, that he might present it to himself a glorious church not having spot or weinkle or any such thing, but that it should be holy and without blemish. From what has been said of the sanctity of the church of Rome and of the protestant church wanting it, it is undeniably evident, that to her, and not to them, all those texts of scripture are justly to be applied; consequently that the church of Rome has this mark of the church of Christ, sanctity.

Universality.

This note of Christ's church none will deny to the church of Rome, who knows her extent and the conversions of the nations of the earth unto her faith. Read Mermanus's Theatrum conversionis Gentium totius orbis, and you will find that all nations in the world, which have ever been converted from idolatry to christianity, have embraced the faith of St. Peter and his successors, the bishops of Rome, and entered into the communion of the Roman church, so that her extent has always reached as far as christianity itself. Those who, at any time, fell off from her faith and communion were, by all the rest of the catholic church, taken for schismatical heretics, as the Arians, Eutychians, Nestorians, Armenians, and those oriental and African churches that fell off to these heresies. Yet neither was her faith extirpated or totally extinct, even in those parts where the said heresies raged the most. For it appears from the testimonies of Basilius, archbishop of Thessalonica, and Demetrius, archbishop of Bulgaria, extant in the codex juris orientalis that the oriental bishops and churches never all forsook the communion of the see of Rome. Nor were all the christians in Syria, Mesapotamia, Babylonica &c. infected with the above mentioned heresies, or divided from the communion of the church of Rome, as appears in Mirus's Notitia episco-Vitravius, Leonardus Abell and other patuum authors.

In our later ages, since protestancy began to cloud some of these northern parts of Europe, the Roman church has dilated to admiration in other regions of the earth, as not only into several parts in the heart of Asia and Africa, but even into the remotest parts of the east, as into the East Indies, China, Japan, Tartary and the islands of the Indian, Chinese, and Japonian seas: into the West Indies and most parts of America and the West Indian islands. See the history of those parts, the Jesuit's letters, and the life of St. Francis Xavier.

Besides, the many great and general councils, consisting of Bishops and doctors gathered together from all parts of the christian world, all owning and embracing the faith and communion of the church of Rome, and excommunicating for schismatics and heretics whoever denied it, sufficiently evidences the universality of the Roman church: so that in her is truly verified what God spoke in the book of Genesis, chap. 28; Thy seed shall be as the dust of the earth, and thou shalt spread abroad to the cast and to the west, to the north and to the south, and in thee and in thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed. In psalm the second it is written, Ask of me and I will give thee the heuthen for thy inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession. And psalm 85. All nations whatsoever thou hast made shall come and worship before thee. Isaiah, ch. 60, it is said. The Gentiles shall come to light and kings to the brightness of thy rising. The abundance of the sea shall be converted unto thee. The sons of strangers shall build upon thy walls and their kings shall minister unto thee. Thy gates shall be continually open, they shall not be shut day nor night, that men may bring unto thee the forces of the Gentiles, and that their kings may be brought unto three. For the nation and kingdom that will not serve thee shall utterly perish; yea those nations shall be utterly wasted. How truly are those words verified in the eastern schismatics, who no sooner left and divided themselves from the Ro-

man church, but they were wasted, overrun and made slaves by the Mahometans and Turks, under whom the Greeks, Nestorians, Eutychians and others of those oriental schismatics and heretics miserably languish to this day, and, which is worse than forsaking the Roman church, their faith perished, and is utterly wasted by heresy and infidelity. But Christ's church, built upon St. Peter, the rock, can never perish, as God promised by the prophet Daniel, chap. 2, in these words: The God of heaven shall set up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall break in pieces, and consume all those kingdoms and it shall stand for ever. And chap. 4. His kingdom is an everlasting kingdom and his dominion from generation Chap. 7. There was given him to generation. dominion and glory and a kingdom, that all people, nations and languages should serve him, His dominion is an everlasting dominion which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed. But the saints of the most high shall take the kingdom and possess it for ever, even for ever and The kingdom and dominion and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven shall be given to the saints of the most high, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom and all dominions shall serve and obey him.

Our blessed Lady, the mother of God, was told by the angel, Luke, chap. I ver. 31, that she shall conceive and bring forth a son and shall call his name Jesus, he shall be great and shall be called the son of the Highest, and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David and he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever, and of his

kingdom there shall be no end.

Our blessed Saviour, the Son of God, thus sent by his omnipotent Father to found and establish this his kingdom, his glorious and universal church, prepares for it a most solid, firm and ever durable foundation, and builds it upon him whom he made to be the rock, upon which it should always stand, saying to him, blessed art thou, Simon Barjona &c. I say unto thee that thou art Peter and upon this rock will I build my church and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. St. Matt. 16.

His holy church being thus securely founded upon this rock, he also gave to this great apostle, St. Peter, power and pastoral authority to feed and govern it, giving him the keys of the kingdom of heaven and bidding him to feed his sheep. He sends his apostles (and in them bishops and priests of his church under St. Peter and his successors, their head) to gather all the nations of the earth into it, St. Matthew 28 and St. Mark 16, giving them their commission in these words "Go ve. therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son, and of the holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you, and behold I am with you all days even to the end of the world. And, for their security in teaching only true and sound doctrine, he promises them. John, 14 and 16, to pray to the Father to send the holy Ghost, the spirit of truth, the comforter, who shall abide with them for ever and shall teach them all things and guide them into all truth. According to this commission, his apostles, and the other bishops and priests of his church, have converted and gathered together all the nations of the christian world unto this one fold, over which St. Peter and his successors are the chief pastors, the church of Rome. This church therefore is universal.

Apostolical succession.

This mark of Christ's church the protestant historians themselves own to belong to the church of Rome, as appears by theirs, as well as by the catholic chronicles, in which are recorded the names of her chief bishops, in a continued line of succession from St. Peter, the apostle, down to our times. St. Peter, that rock, upon which Christ built his church, that apostle to whom Christ gave the keys, that pastor to whom Christ gave power and authority to feed and govern his whole flock, that confirmer of his brethren, for whom Christ prayed that his faith should never fail, has never wanted a successor in his apostolic chair, from his time even to our present pope Innocent the twelfth, who now sits in the see apostolic, the head of the church.

· Besides, the church of Rome has, at all times since the apostles, continued visible to the world, bishops, priests and people visibly communicating with her from all parts of the christian world; ecclesiastical writers, fathers, doctors publicly defending her faith in all ages; saints, martyrs and public professors of her faith in all ages; eighteen general councils, besides almost innumerable others, all defending her faith, owning and embracing her faith; in which the prophecy of Isaiah is fulfilled chap. vi. ver. 6, I have set watchmen upon thy walls, O Jerusalem, which shall never hold their peace day or night. And in her continued succession of chief pastors is verified what was foretold by Jeremias the prophet, chap. 33, Thus saith the Lord of hosts. Again in this place which is desolate &c. shall be an habitation of shepherds, causing their flocks to lie down in the cities of the mountains &c. And in the city of Judea shall the flocks pass again under the hands of him who counteth them, neither shall the priests of the Levites want a man before me to offer burnt offerings, to kindle meat offerings, and to do sacrifice continually. Thus saith the Lord, if you can break my covenant of the day and my covenant of the nights, and that there should not be a day

and night in their season: then may also my covenant be broken with David, my servant, that he should not have a son to reign upon his throne and with the Levites, the priests, my ministers. So that day, and night shall sooner leave off succeeding one another, than the succession of pastors fail or be interrupted in God's Church. Christ, says St. Paul to the Ephesians chap. 4 ver. 12, gave some apostles, and some prophets and some evangelists and some pastors, to the consummation of the saints, unto the work of the ministry, unto the edifying the body of Christ, until we all meet in the unity of faith and knowledge of the Son

of God.

The Roman church is not only apostolical in her chief pastors', bishops', priests', and people's perpetual visibility and entire succession, but also, in her faith, doctrine, sacrifice and sacraments, which she has always held entire and inviolate. from the times of the apostles to this day, as evidently appears from the holy scriptures rightly expounded, and from the general councils, and in the writings of the holy fathers and doctors of every age since the apostles, whose testimonies in defence of every point of faith, now in debate between her and her adversaries, you may find collected out of their works, as I have said above, by Jodocus Coccius in his Thesaurus Catholicus and in Gaulterus's Tabulæ chronologicæ, which neither protestants nor any other pretended church in the world can evidence of theirs. In the Roman church only, therefore, is verified what was spoken by the prophets. Isaias the prophet chap. 2, says: in the last day, it shall come to pass that the mountain of the house of the Lord shall be established on the tops of mountains, and it shall be exalted above the hills, and people flow unto it. And many nations shall come and say, let us go up to the mountain of the Lord and to the house of the

God of Jacob, and he shall teach us his ways and we will walk in his paths: for the law shall go forth from Sion, the word of the Lord from Jerusalem. The prophet Malachy, chap. 1, ver. 11, says. From the rising of the sun to the going down my name is great among the gentiles, and in every place there is sacrificing and there is offered to my name a clean oblation. Isaiah 12. "In that day there shall be an altar to the Lord in the midst of the land of Egypt. And the Egyptians shall know the Lord in that day, and shall do sacrifice and oblation, as the translation has it, but the vulgate bible has it, shall worship in hosts. Isaiah 56. "Also the sons of strangers, who join themselves to the Lord to serve him &c., even them will I bring to my holy mountain and make them joyful in my house of prayer, their burnt offerings and sacrifices shall be axcepted upon my altar, for my house shall be called a house of prayer to all people. And chap. 59, my spirit that is in thee, and my words, which I have put into thy mouth, shall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy seed, nor out of the mouth of thy seed's seed, saith the Lord of hosts, from henceforth and for ever. And chap. 60, I will make thee an eternal excellency of joy to many generations &c. Thy sun shall no more go down, neither shall thy moon withdraw itself, for the Lord shall be thy everlasting light. Thy people, also, shall be all rightcons, they shall inherit the land for ever; the branch of my planting, the work of my hands, that I may be glorified."

Thus was foretold by the prophets the glory of Christ's church, the perpetuity and excellency of its sacrifice, and the infallibility of its holy faith. This is the church built upon St. Peter, against

which the gates of hell shall never prevail.

To conclude, it being thus undeniably evident that the church of Rome has all the said notes and marks of Christ's church, it follows of course, that the Roman church only is the true church.

That God, in his infinite goodness and mercy, may make you, Mr. Ritschel, and all those who are of your communion, true and lively members of this her one, holy, catholic and apostolical church, is and shall be the daily prayer of

Your truly well-wisher and humble servant, THOS, WARD,

P. S. I have annexed to this some proofs from the sacred scripture, and the testimonies of the primitive fathers in support, of four of the most remarkable points of catholic faith denied by you protestants, viz. the pope's supremacy, the real presence, purgatory and the invocation of the angels and saints. This I have done in compliance with your request at our conference. That of the pope's supremacy is, in substance, what I sent you before, in a former letter, which you having concealed, I thought it good to put it down here again' for the reader's satisfaction.

THE pope's supremacy and spiritual jurisdiction over the whole catholic or visible church on earth proved from sacred scripture and the primitive

fathers.

To begin at the first foundation or root of this primacy, or spiritual government, over the visible church, when our Saviour first beheld Simon the son of Jonas he made him this prophetic promise of giving him a new name, in these words; thou art Simon, the son of Jonas: thou shall be called Cephas, which is by interpretation a stone, that is to say, a rock or Peter. For, as St. Jerome witness-

es, that which the Hebrews and Syrians call cephas is by the Greeks and Latins called petra, so that, the words cephas, Peter, and rock are and signify the same thing. Here, you see, the promise is made that Simon should afterwards be called Peter or rock, signifying that he should be as firm and solid a foundation in supporting the building and superstructure of Christ's church militant, as a stone or rock is in supporting the house which is founded and built upon it.

When our Lord and Saviour made choice of his twelve apostles, then it was that he gave unto Simon this before promised name, as the evangelist tells us in these words. "He ordained twelve who should be with him and that he might send them forth to preach and to have power to heal sicknesses and to cast out devils. And Simon he surnamed Peter. Which is to say, he ordained twelve, but made Simon the rock or foundation of them all.

The Godhead of Christ being revealed to Simon Peter from heaven, and he confessing it in these words: thou art the son of the living God, then it was that our Saviour shewed him the reason of his new name, answering him thus: and I say unto thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it, and I will give thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, shall be loosed also in heaven.

Here it is to be observed, that the name *Peter* is no sooner confirmed to him, than a new promise is made, viz. upon this rock I will build my church &c.

Upon St. Peter testifying his love to our Saviour above and more than all the other apostles, he performs what before he had promised him, viz.

builds his church upon him, gives him the keys and makes him chief pastor over his whole flock, in these words of the gospel: feed my lambs, feed my lambs, feed my sheep. By the word, lambs twice spoken, are signified the Jews and gentiles; by the word sheep is meant the rest of the apostles, which together comprehend and include the whole church, both laity, bishops, priests and elergy. And for St. Peter to be made the pastor of this flock, is to have the church built on him and to have the key of providing and dispensing to them all things necessary for their spiritual sustentation, as also of ruling and governing them, which the giving of the keys also signifies; as when, for example, a prince gives the keys of a city to him, whom he designs shall have the care of them, he thereby invests him with a power and authority, not only to open and shut the gates, but also to rule and govern the whole city under him. So, I say, St. Peter has the visible church committed to his pastoral charge and government in this life. And this spiritual supremacy of St. Peter over the rest of his brethren, the apostles, is yet further evident from these words of our Saviour to him: I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not, and thou being converted confirm thy brethren: for he that confirms and strengthens others must needs be greater and exercise a superiority or jurisdiction over them, and they, on the other hand, less than he who confirms them, for of equals, one has not what the other wants, nor wants what the other has.

I might further observe St Peter's being always named first in scripture, and in every council and consultation of the apostles always speaking first, which, though they are no small argument of primacy in him over the rest, yet I need not insist upon them, what is said being sufficient from sacred scripture.

I shall, therefore, proceed to give you the testimony of the holy fathers and doctors of the church in the first four or five ages, where you will see the spiritual supremacy of St. Peter and his successors, the popes of Rome, vindicated, and also the sense in which those primitive fathers un-

derstood the aforesaid texts of scripture.

St. Clement, who was a disciple of St. Peter and afterwards pope, writes thus: "Simon Peter, for the reward of this true faith and preaching of sound doctrine, is defined to be the foundation of the church, for which reason he is also, by the divine mouth of the Lord, surnamed Peter, who was, by our Lord's first election, chief of the apostles, to whom, as chief, God the Father revealed his son." Again, "the apostles were not all equals, but one presided over all." And in his second epistle he calls St. Peter "the blessed apostle, the father of all the apostles, who received the keys of the kingdom of heaven." He also styles him "blessed Peter, prince of the apostles."

St. Anacletus, who was the next pope after St. Clement, writes thus: "Both Christ commanded and the apostles decreed, that great and more difficult questions should be referred to the see apostolic, upon which Christ built his universal church." He says further, "this most holy Roman and apostolic church obtained from our blessed Lord himself the primacy and eminency of power over all churches and the whole flock of christian people, even as he said to St. Peter, the apostle, thou art Peter and upon this rock I will

build my church."

St. Evaristus, St. Alexander and others, his successors, held the same, as is seen in their

epistles.

St. Polycarp, who was disciple to St. John the evangelist, went from Smyrna in Asia to Rome for the decision of certain questions concerning the keeping of Easter.

St. Irenæus, whose words are more at large cited in the the tree of life, says, "It is necessary, that every church should have recourse to this, by reason of its more powerful principality."

St. Pius the first says of Christ, "he hath also ordained his holy apostolic see to be the head of all churches, in saying to the prince of the apostles: thou art Peter and upon this rock will I build my church &c. and I will give thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven.

St. Theophilus, bishop of Antioch, speaks of the Jewish synagogue and the church of Christ thus "the synagogue is mother-in-law to St. Peter, but the church is his daughter, whose go-

vernment Peter has received or obtained."

Tertullian, in several places of his works, styles the pope, "the greatest bishop, bishop of bishops and blessed and apostolical pope."

All these fathers lived in the first and second centuries after Christ: and in the third wrote those

that follows.

Origen says: "behold that great foundation of the church and that most solid rock, on which Christ had founded his church." In another place: "Peter, upon which the church of Christ is built, against which the gates of hell shall not prevail." And on St. Paul's epistle to the Romans he further says: "When the chief charge of feeding Christ's sheep was given to St. Peter and the church founded upon him, there was required of him the confession of no virtue, but charity." On St. Matt. chap. 10, he calls him, "the foundation of the church."

St. Hypolitus calls him; "Peter, the prince, the rock of faith, whom Christ our God has judged blessed: he, the doctor of the church, the chief of the disciples, he who has the keys of the kingdom."

St. Cyprian says: "God is one: one Christ,

one church and one chair, founded upon Peter by the word of Christ. Christ gave this power, first, to Peter, upon whom he built his church, and from whence he instituted and declared the beginning of unity. We hold Peter the head and root of the church."

Arnobius expresses himself excellently upon this point. "One of the apostles," says he, "has received the name of Peter. For our Lord Jesus Christ alone said, I am the good pastor, and my sheep follow me. But, after the resurrection, he granted this holy power and the name thereof to Peter repenting. And, though thrice denied, yet he gave unto him, who denied him, this power which he himself only had." Thus Arnobius; from whose words you may learn that, while our Saviour was visibly with his apostles upon earth, he made none of them pastor, because he himself was their pastor visible among them. But, after his resurrection, when he was to deprive them of his visible presence, then he made and constituted another visible pastor in his place, viz. St. Peter, to whom he gave the charge of his sheep or visible flock upon earth. We will now enter upon the fourth century.

St. Athanasius, writing to pope Liberius, says: "the universal church is commended to you by Christ, that you may labour for all and not be negligent in assisting every one." And in his Epis: ad Felicem he says of St. Peter: "thou art Peter and upon thy foundation the pillars of the church, that is, the bishops, are established." The same St. Athanasius, though patriarch of Alexandria, yet, when persecuted by the Arians, both he and seven Grecian bishops made their appeal to pope Julius, as to the highest court of ecclesiastical judicature on earth. Sozomen in his history relates it thus. "Athanasius, leaving Alexandria, went to Rome. He happened, at the

same time, to meet there Paul, archbishop of Constantinople, Marcellus of Ancyra and Asclepas of Gaza, which Asclepas, being an enemy to the Arians, was injured by them and condemned under pretence of having overthrown an altar, in whose place the church of Gaza is committed to one Quintianus. Also Lucianus, bishop of Adrianople, being for another accusation deprived of his see, was then at Rome. The bishop of Rome, taking cognizance of all the crimes of every one of them, and finding them all agree to the Nicene council. received them into the communion, as one who had the charge of all by the dignity of his own see, and restored them all again to their own churches, writing to the eastern bishops, and blaming them for the ill treatment of men not deserving it, as in expelling them from their churches. He likewise reproved them for their not observing the constitutions of the Nicene council, and commanded some of the Arian bishops to appear before him on a certain day, that he might shew them that he had given a just decree or sentence against them and threatened that, unless they would cease from these troubles and novelties, he would no longer suffer Thus he wrote and Athanansius and Paulas sent letters to the eastern bishops and they were all received again to their own sees". How clear an evidence is this of the pope's supremacy over all the rest, when so great a patriarch as that of Alexandria, so great an archbishop as he of new Rome or Constantinople, and other bishops made their appeals to him for redress in their injuries from the Arians; and that for no other reason but for the dignity of his own proper see, and his having charge over all; by virtue of which authority he could justly examine, judge, and determine their cause, pass sentence upon their enemies, and command them not only to appear before him, but also, by his letters, force them to receive the

said injured bishops again into their sees. This is matter of fact.

There were, likewise, frequent appeals from other parts of the world, before this, to the bishops of Rome. For instance, Marcian appealed to pope Pius the first. Fortunatus and Felix, in Africa, made their appeal to pope Cornelius. Basilides, in Spain, appealed to pope Stephen &c. Thus you see that all owned the see apostolic for the supreme and highest tribunal upon earth.

St. Cyril of Jerusalem, calls him, "Peter, the prince, and most excellent of all the Apostles." St. Basil the great, says. "Peter, because he excelled in faith, received in himself the edification of the church." "Peter is a rock through Christ the rock." St. Epiphanius says thus of St. Peter; "Our blessed Lord himself constituted him chief of the apostles, a firm rock, on which the church of God is built, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it: for the gates of hell are heresies and the broachers of heresies. For it must needs be, that the faith is established in him who has received the keys of heaven."

St. Optatus Milevetanus, writing to Permenian, the heretic, tells him thus. "Thou canst not deny, but thou knowest that the episcopal chair was first erected at Rome by St. Peter, in which Peter did sit, the head of all the apostles, for which reason he was also called Cephas, to the end that in this one chair, unity might be preserved amongst all; and that the other apostles might not every one maintain other seats for themselves in opposition to this. So that he would be a schismatic and sinner whosoever should set up another chair to contend with this one. The chair therefore is only one, which is one of its endowments. In this Peter sat first, Linus succeeded him." So he reckons up the popes by name till he comes to pope Siricius, "who is," says he, "contemporary at

this day, with whom we and the whole world hold communion by circular epistles, and agree as one body." "Now," says he to the Donatists, "do you declare to us the foundation of your church, who pretend to be the holy church."

St. John Chrysostom says, "Christ has shed his blood to gain to himself those sheep, the charge or care of which he committed to Peter, and Pe-

ter's successors."

St. Jerom, writing to pope Damasus concerning the Trinity, and demanding his counsel in some things against the Arians, in several parts of his epistle says thus: "I thought it best to ask counsel of the chair of Peter, and faith praised by the mouth of the apostles. I speak to the successor of the fisherman, and to the disciples of the cross. I follow no chief but Christ. I join myself in communion to your holiness, that is, to the chair of Peter. Upon the rock I know the church is Whosoever eats the lamb out of this house is profane. Whosoever is not in the ark of Noah shall perish in the flood. I know not Vitalis, I despise Miletius, I have no acquaintance with Paulinus. Whosoever gathers not with thee scatters abroad; that is, he that is not of Christ is of antichrist.' Again, "The health of the church depends upon the dignity of the chief bishop, to whom if there were not given a certain excellent and eminent power over all, there would be as many schisms in the church as there are priests. St. Ambrose says: "Though Andrew followed our Saviour before Peter, yet Andrew received not the primacy, but Peter. Christ being to ascend into heaven left us St. Peter, the vicar of his love."

St. Augustine writes thus to Pettillian: "What fault has the chair of the Roman church done to thee, in which St. Peter sat, and in which, at this

day, Anastasius sitteth? The whole christian world, in the fransmarine and most remote parts of the earth, is subject to him, who sits in the chair of the Roman church. The succession of priests from the very seat of St. Peter, the apostle, to whom our Lord after his resurrection commended the feeding of his sheep, the succession, I say, of priests, from St. Peter to this present bishop, retains and keeps me in the church." "Beckon up," says he, "the priests even in the chair of Peter, and in that list of fathers see the order of succession: that is the rock against which the proud gates of hell shall never prevail. If we are to consider the order of bishops succeeding one another, how much more certainly and truly to the purpose do we reckon from St. Peter himself, to whom Christ, being the representative of the whole church, said, upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. For Linus succeeded Peter, Clement succeeded Linus, Anacletus succeeded Clement." And thus he names every pope till he comes to pope Anastasius, who at that time sat in the chair of St. Peter. "And in all this list of succession" says he to the Donatists, "there is not one Donatist bishop to be found." Thus St. Augustine.

The first council of Nice was gathered in the year of our Lord 325. In it were three hundred and eighteen bishops. The beginning of the sixth canon of this council, as you will find it cited by Paschasius, the pope's legate, in the sixteenth act of the council of Chalcedon, is this "Ecclesia Romana semper habuit primatum": that is, "the Roman church has always had the primacy," Upon the citing of which words in the said canon, the judges in the council of Chalcedon unaniunanimously answered: "Perpendimus omnem

primatum et honorem præcipuum secundum canones antiquæ Romæ Deo amantissimo archiepiscopo conservari: that is, "we judge all primacy and special honour to be given by God to the most beloved archbishop of old Rome." Read the act of the council of Chalcedon and you will find this.

The second general council, gathered in the year 381 at Constantinople, writing to pope Damasus calls itself, "his proper members" and desires him "to confirm their council." The council of Ephesus, which was the third general council, was celebrated anno 431; in it were two hundred fathers, who sent a solemn embassy to pope Celestine with all their decrees, that they might be confirmed by him, telling him in their letters, that "necessity required that whatsoever they had acted in the council should be referred to his examination, and that they are all of his judgement, that what his holiness decreed ought to remain solid and firm."

The council of Chalcedon was gathered anno 451. In it were six hundred and thirty fathers. In the first act of the council, pope Leo is called "most blessed and apostolical man, pope of Rome,

who is the head of the church."

In the second session of this council, when the pope's epistle was read, the whole council in aeclamation said that "St. Peter speaks by the

mouth of pope Leo."

In the third session the council styles him, "universal archbishop, universal patriarch, bishop of the universal church, catholic or universal pope, the head over all the members." It farther observes, that "the custody of our Lord's vineyard, that is, of the whole church, is committed to pope Leo by our Saviour himself."

If there be a man whose assent to so evident and undeniable a truth cannot be extorted by these testimonies, let it be imputed to a wilful obstinacy;

for the remedy of which let him humbly beg for grace, which I pray God in his mercy to grant him.

THE real presence of Christ's body and blood in the blessed sacrament of the eucharist, proved from holy scripture, and the testimonies of the primitive fathers.

What the Son of God has affirmed let us not deny nor disbelieve; what he has promised let no one doubt but that he both can and will perform; for he, being God, is omnipotent; and, being truth itself, what he has spoken must of necessity be true. In the sixth chapter of St. John, he promised to give us his flesh to eat, and, in the 26th chapter of St. Matthew, he actually performed this promise, giving it to his disciples, and affirming what he there gave them to be his body and blood. Who will then deny it to be his body and blood, and who will presume to contradict the Son of God and say, it is not thy body, Lord, it is only bread? Let him consider these words of St. Augustine, Serm. 2 de verb. Ap. chap. 4. "Christ, commending the sacrament of the faithful to us, said, except you eat the flesh of the son of man and drink his blood you shall not have life in you. So life itself speaketh of life, and to him that thinketh life to be a liar, this meat shall be death and not life." Who will dare again to ask that Jewish question, how can it be the body and blood of Christ, when he considers that Christ, to whom nothing is impossible, has said, it is?

Let him be corrected by these words of St. Cyril, who, speaking of the Jews making that demand, says: "How came they not to recollect that nothing is impossible to God, who weakly said, how can this man give us his flesh? But we may greatly profit ourselves by their sin, believing the mysteries, and learning never to say or once think how, for it is a Jewish word and deserves all punishment." Let those, who doubt of this divine truth, and deny the body and blood of Christ to bereally present in the blessed sacrament, read our Saviour's words in the gospels, and, if they believe him that speaks to be God, let them no longer doubt or question the truth of what he says. In St. John's gospel, he says; I am the living bread which came down from heaven, if any man eat of this bread he shall live for ever, and the bread, which I will give, is my flesh for the life of the world. Ver. 53. Unless you cat the flesh of the son of man and drink his blood you shall not have life in you : he that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath everlasting life, and I will raise him up at the last day, for my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed. He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood abideth in me and I in him. As the living Father hath sent me and I live by the Father, so he that eateth me, even he also shall live by me. St. Matt. chap. 26, ver. 26. Jesus took bread, and blessed it and broke it, and gave it to his disciples, saying; take and cat, this is my body; and taking the chalice, he gave thanks, and gave to them, saying: drink you all of this, for this is my blood of the new testament, which shall be shed for many unto the remission of sins." St. Mark testifies the same, chap. 14. So St. Luke chap. 22. St. Paul, Corinthian's 11, taught by our Lord himself after his ascension, says, I received of our Lord that which I delivered unto you. That our Lord, on the night that he was betrayed, took bread,

and giving thanks, he broke it and said : Take and eut, this is my body which shall be delivered for you. Do this in commemoration of me. In like manner he took the chalice after he had supped; saying : This chalice is the new testament in my blood. This do ye, as often as you shall drink, for the commemoration of me. For, as often as you shall eat this bread and drink the chalice, you shall shew the death of our Lord until he come. Therefore, whosoever shall eat this bread or drink the chalice of our Lord unworthily, he shall be guilty of the body and blood of our Lord. But let a man prove himself and so let him eat of that bread and drink of the chalice; for, he that eateth and drinketh unworthily cateth and drinketh judgment to himself not discerning the body of our Lord.

If any one here should object, that St. Paul calls it bread, and therefore it is no more than common bread; such are to understand, that he calls it so, in the same sense as our Saviour himself called it bread, St. John chap. 6, viz. the bread of life, the bread which is his flesh; for, otherwise, the word of the apostle would be contradictory to those of our Saviour, which cannot be imagined. And were it meant by the apostle to be no more than mere bread, how could be reprove any one for not discerning it to be our Lord's body? And how could a man be guilty of unworthily receiving the body and blood of our Lord if he reeeive not our Lord's body and blood, but only common bread? St. Augustine says: "It is he whom the apostle says shall be damned who by singular veneration or adoration does not make a difference between this meat and all other." in Psalm 98. "No man eateth it before he first adore the flesh of Christ in the mysterics." St. Chrysostom, Hom. 24 in 1st. Cor. says: "we adore him on the altar, as the sages did in the manger."

St. Gregory Nazianzen in Epitaph: Gorgoniæ says, "My sister called on him who is worshipped on the altar." Now those holy fathers, and the church of God in their times, would not have worshipped and adored the holy sacrament, if they had not believed it to have been the body and blood of Christ; because to have worshipped common bread had been idolatry. And I think no protestant (at least of the church of England) will condemn them as idolaters, especially if they consider, that they hold the church to have been pure and uncorrupted in the times of these holy fathers.

Nothing is more evident than that the holy fathers of the first four or five hundred years after Christ, as well as those of every age since, taught and believed the real presence of Christ's body and blood in the Eucharist, as their writings suf-

ficiently testify.

St. Ignatius, the martyr, in Epis: ad Romanos anno 98, says, "I would not eat the food of corruption, neither do I desire the pleasures of this world. The bread of God is that which I would have, the heavenly bread, the bread of life, which is the flesh of Jesus Christ, the Son of the living God, who, in the fulness of time, was born of the seed of David and Abraham; and the drink which I desire is his blood, which is an uncorruptible delight, and eternal life." And epis: ad Smyr: he confesses the Eucharist to be "the flesh of Christ, which suffered for us."

St. Justin, the martyr, in Apol: 2. ad Antoninum Imp: says; "we do not take those as common bread and common wine, but as Jesus Christ, our Saviour, was incarnate by the word of God, and had flesh and blood for our salvation, so we are taught that the food (by which our flesh and blood are by transmutation nourished) when con-

secrated by the prayers of his word is made the flesh and blood of the same Jesus incarnate."

St. Irenæus, lib: 4. adver: Hæres: cap: 34, writing against certain heretics who denied Christ to be the Son of God, says: "how should they believe that bread (for which thanks are given) to be the body of our Lord, and the chalice to be his blood, if they deny him to be the Son of the Maker of the world? Again, how, say they, the flesh shall come into corruption, and not receive life, which is nourished with the body and blood of our Lord?" And in chap. 57: "our Lord taking bread declared it to be his body, and the mixture in the chalice he affirmed to be his blood."

Tertullian, lib. de Resurrectione, says: "The flesh is washed that the soul may be purged; the flesh is anointed, that the soul may be consecrated; the flesh is signed that the soul may be defended; the flesh is overshadowed with the imposition of hands, that the soul may be illuminated by the Holy Ghost; the flesh is fed with the body and blood of Christ, that the soul may be fed by God." And lib. 4, con Marcion: "our Lord taking bread and giving it to his disciples, made it his body by saying, This is my body."

Origen, in Homilia in diversos, says: "when thou receivest that holy meat, and incorruptible banquet, when thou enjoyest the bread and cup of life, thou eatest and drinkest the body and blood of our Lord; then our Lord enters under thy roof. Do thou, therefore, humbling thyself, imitate the centurion, and say, Lord I am not worthy that thou shouldst enter under my roof. For, where he enters under the roof of an unworthy receiver, there he enters to judgment." And in Hom. 38 in St. Lucam, he says, "If we eat not the bread of life, if we are not fed with the flesh of Christ, and inebriated with his blood, if we con-

temn the sumptuous banquet of our Lord and Saviour, we ought to know that God has both benignity and severity."

Eusebius, Hom. 5, writes thus: "Away with all doubt of infidelity; for he, who is the author of the gifts, is also witness of the truth; for the invisible priest by his secret power, with his word, converts the visible creatures (bread and wine) into the substance of his body and blood, saying: take and cat, this is my body, and, the sanctification repeated, take and drink, this is my blood. Before they are consecrated by the invocation of the most high name, they are in substance bread and wine, but, after the words of Christ, they are the body and blood of Christ. And why should we wonder, that he, who could create them by his word, can now, after their creation, change them by his word? Indeed, it is a lesser miracle to change a thing into a better, than to make it out of nothing."

St. Gregory of Nyssa, in Serm. Catech. de divinis sacramentis, says: "We do rightly believe that the bread, sanctified by the word of God, is

changed into the body of the Son of God."

St. Hilarius of Poitiers, lib. 8, de Trinitate, says: "If Christ, the Son, were truly made flesh, and we truly receive the word in our Lord's meat, the word made flesh, how can it be otherwise thought, but that he naturally remains in us, who, being born man, has assumed to himself the inseparable nature of our flesh, and hath mixed or united with it the nature of his flesh to the nature of eternity, under the sacrament of his flesh communicated to us: for thus all are one, the Father in Christ, and Christ in us? What we say of the natural verity of Christ in us, would be foolish and impious, if we did not speak it from him: but he says, my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed; he who eateth my flesh, and

drinketh my blood dwelleth in me, and I in him. Of the truth, therefore, of his flesh and blood there is left no room for doubt, for, by the profession of our Lord himself, and by our faith, it is truly flesh and blood. And these things, namely, his flesh and blood, taken and received, bring it to pass, that both we are in Christ, and Christ in us. Is not this truth? Let it not happen true to those who deny Christ Jesus to be the Son of God. Therefore, he is in us by his flesh, and we are in him. As the Son liveth by the Father, even so do we live by his flesh."

St. Cyril of Jerusalem, Catech: mistag. 4. says: "Though to thy senses it appears bread, yet it is his body, according to his words. Let faith confirm thee; judge not by sense. After the words of our Lord let no doubt arise in thy mind. The bread that is seen by us, is not bread, but the body of Christ; and the wine that we behold, though it seem wine to the taste, yet it is not wine, but the blood of Christ. Christ changed water into wine by his only will, and shall he not be worthy of our belief, that he has changed wine

into his blood?"

St. Ambrose lib de eis, qui mysteriis initiantur; cap. 9 says: "the light is better than the shadow, truth than the figure, the body of the author than manna from heaven. Perhaps thou wilt say, I see another thing, and how then do you tell me I receive the body of Christ? We shall make use of many great examples, to prove this not to be that which nature made, but that which the benediction has consecrated, and the power of benediction to be greater than that of nature, because by benediction even nature itself is changed. Moses had the rod in his hand; he cast it from him and it became a serpent; again he took hold of the tail of the serpent, and it turned again into the nature of a rod. Thou seest, therefore, by prophetic

grace nature was twice changed: first, to that of a serpent, then, to that of a rod. The rivers of Egypt ran in a channel of pure water; yet by and by their fountains were changed into blood: again, by the prayers of the prophet the rivers ceased to be blood, and assumed the former nature of water. The Hebrew people were every way surrounded, on the one side by the Egyptian army; on the other by the red sea; Moses lifted up his rod, and the water divided itself, and stood congealed like walls, leaving a road between the water. The river Jordan, contrary to nature, stopped its course and turned its stream back towards its fountain. Must it not be granted, that nature was changed both in the waves of the sea and the course of the river? Understand, therefore, that grace has greater power than nature, and here we shew you the grace of prophetic benediction. But, human benediction was of such force as to change nature, what shall we say of divine eonsecration itself, where the word of our Saviour himself operates? For that sacrament, which thou reeeivest, was made by the words of Christ. Elias by his word had power to cause fire to come down from heaven, shall not the words of Christ have power to change the species of the elements? Thou hast read of the works of the whole world; he spoke the word and they were made, he commanded and they were created. Is not the word of Christ (which could make out of nothing, that which was not before) therefore able to change those things that are, into that which they were not? For it is easier to change the nature of things than to make them anew. But why do we argue thus? Let us look for examples lating to himself and confirm the truth of this mystery by the example of his incarnation. Nature had no hand in it when Jesus was born of the virgin Mary. If we look for the order of nature,

a woman cannot conceive but by the man: it follows, therefore, that it is above the order of nature for the blessed virgin to bring forth; and this body which we consecrate is the same which was born of the virgin. Why then dost thou seek here the order of nature in the body of Christ, when the birth of our Lord Jesus Christ himself, being from a virgin, is above nature? So likewise the sacrament of this flesh is indeed the very true flesh of Christ, which was crucified and laid in a sepulchre, the same Lord Jesus saying, this is my body."

St. Jerom, Cor. 2. says; "our Saviour delivered us this sacrament, that by it we should always commemorate his death for us. Therefore, when we receive it, we are by the priests put in mind, that it is the body and blood of Christ, and that we should not be ungrateful for the benefits received." And ad Hed: ib, cap, 2, "the bread, which our Lord broke and gave to his disciples, is the body of our Lord and Saviour, seeing he said unto them: take and eat, this is my body, and the chalice is that of which he again said, drink ye all

of this, this is my blood, &c."

St. Chrysostom, Hom. 83 in St. Matt. 26, says; "let us believe that God is in every place, and, though what he says seems unlikely to our senses and apprehension, yet let us not resist him. Let his words, I pray, overpower both our senses and reason, yea, in every thing, but especially in these mysteries, not only looking on the things that are before us, but also observing his words; for by his words we cannot be deceived; our senses may easily deceive us, but his words cannot be false. Our senses may often deceive us. Seeing then that he has said, this is my body, let no doubt possess us, but let us believe and behold it with the eyes of our understanding. O! say some, I would see his form, his shape, his garments. Behold thou seest

himself, thou touchest himself, thou eatest himself; thou desirest to see his garments, but he has delivered himself to thee, not only that thou mayst behold him, but also that thou mayst touch him and have him within thee." In the same homily he says; "these works are not of human power: he, who performed them in that his last supper, is now also the operator, it is he that effeets it, we are his ministers: truly, he, who sanctifies and changes these things, is himself." And in Homil. 45, in Joannem, "Christ, to shew us his love, by his body has mixed himself with us, and has reduced it unto one with us, that the body may be united with the head." And Hom. 24, "that which is in the chalice is the same which flowed out of the side of Christ, and we are partakers thereof."

St. Augustine, serm. ad Neophit, says: "Receive, this is the bread that hanged on the cross; take, this is the chalice that sprung out of the side of Christ: it shall be death not life to him that thinks Christ a liar." In another place he says: "He was carried in his own hands; but, brethren, who can understand how this can be done in man? What man is carried in his own hands? He may be carried in the hands of others, but in his own he cannot be carried. How this must be understood of David himself according to the letter we cannot find out, but we find that it may be undrestood of Christ; for Christ was carried in his own hands when, giving the same body, he said, this is my body; for that body he bore in his own hands. And he was carried in his own hands; how was he carried in his own hands? In so much that, when he gave the same his body and his blood, he took into his own hands that which the faithful know, and he carried himself after a certain manner, when he said, this is my body. Come unto him and be illuminated; for what he has said,

that he has proved," &c. Let us go to him and be illuminated, not as the Jews approached him and were darkened; for, they went to him that they might crucify him. But we have access unto him, that we may receive his body and blood. The Jews by crucifying him were covered with darkness; we, by eating and drinking him crucified, are illuminated." And in Epis. 3, ad Julian: he says: "Christ vouchsafed to give us himself to be eaten, who said, I am the bread of life which came down from heaven, he who eats my flesh and drinks my blood hath eternal life in him. But, let every one examine himself before he receive the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, and so, as the apostle commanded, let him eat of that bread and drink of the chalice. he who unworthily cats the body and blood of our Lord, eats and drinks judgment to himself, not discerning the body of our Lord. When, therefore, we intend to receive, before all things, we ought to have recourse to confession and penance, and diligently examine all our deeds and actions, and if we find any hurtful sins in ourselves, let us readily wash them away by confession and true penance."

St. Cyril of Alexandria, lib. 4, Evang. Joan. cap. 13, i4, 15, 16, and 17, largely proves the sacrament of the holy eucharist to be the body and blood of our Lord, and that we receiving it are thereby made one with him, and have eternal life. "Though," says he, "by the nature of our flesh, we are corruptible, yet, by participation of life, we are reformed to the property of life. For, not only our souls were to be lifted up by the Holy Ghost to eternal life, but also this rude, gross, earthly body of ours is to be reduced to immortality by touching, tasting and eating this agreeable food of Christ's body; and when Christ says, I will raise him up, he

means, that his body which he eats shall raise him up. The holy body of Christ is the true food nourishing to life eternal: and his blood is the true drink that entirely drives away death: for they are not the body and blood of a mere man, but that of him that being joined to life, is made life itself, and therefore we are the body and members of Christ, because, by this benediction of the mysteries we receive the Son of God himself."

St. Gaudentius tract 2, de Exod. says: "The maker and Lord of nature, who produces bread from the earth, does again of bread make his own body, because he can and has promised to do it; and he, who of water made wine, makes of wine his own blood."

St. Euthymius in St. Matthew, chap. 26, says: "As the old testament had sacrifices and blood, so also has the new testament, namely, the body and blood of our Lord. Christ did not say, these are signs of my body and blood, but, these are my body and blood. We must not, therefore, look upon the nature of the things set before us, but their virtue, for as he supernaturally deified (if we may use the expression) the flesh which he assumed, even so, in an ineffable manner, he changes these things, namely, the bread and wine, into the same his vivifying body, and into the same his precious blood. Seeing we all partake of one body and one blood, we are, by the participation of these mysteries, all one, all in Christ and Christ in us all. He who cats my flesh and drinks my blood dwells in me and I in him. For truly the Son of man by taking flesh is united to the flesh, the flesh is again by participation united to us. And in the 6th. chapter of St. John: "Whosoever eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood abideth in me and I in him. He remains in me, he is united to me by the transumption and

communication of my flesh and blood, and he is made my own body and partakes of the life which is in me."

St. Remigius, 1 Cor. chap. 10 says, "the flesh, which the Son of God the Father, took in the Virgin's womb, in the unity of his person, and the bread, which is consecrated in the church, are one body of Christ; for, as that flesh is the body of Christ, so this bread is changed into the body of Christ; and yet they are not two bodies but

one body."

St. Gregory the great (Paul the deacon in his life) says: "Our creator, well knowing our infirmity, by that power with which he made all things of nothing, and by the sanctification of his spirit, converts the bread mixed with water (their proper species still remaining) into his flesh and blood: And in the fourth book of his dialogues he writes: "There indeed his body is received, his flesh is distributed to the salvation of the people, his blood is now received, not into the hands of infidels, but into the mouths of the faithful: Who of the faithful can doubt, but that, in the time of immolation, the heavens are opened to the voice of the priest, and that the choirs of angels are present at this mystery of Jesus Christ".

St. John Damascen lib: 4 de Fide cap. 14, says: "The bread, wine and water are, by the invocation of the Holy Ghost, changed supernaturally into the body and blood of Jesus Christ.

I might add to these the testimonies of the fathers and writers of every age, even to this present day: but this being too tedious and unnecessary, I shall refer you to their works, where you may read their faith and doctrine concerning this point at your leisure.

And, at this present day, it is not only the faith of the western church, but also of all the Greek and eastern churches throughout all christendom

as is made undeniably evident by Mr. Arnaud in his book of the *Perpetuity*, where are recorded the authentic attestations of all those oriental churches, as to the doctrine of the real presence, transubstantiation, addration of the blessed sacrament, and its being a propitiatory sacrifice of

the living and the dead.

In the end of the third tome of the Perpetuity you will find for all this the attestations of it: first, for the Greek cliurch of the patriarchate of Constantinople: secondly, for the Greek church of the patriarchate of Alexandria: thirdly, for the Greek cliurch of the patriarchate of Jerusalem: fourthly, for the Greek church of the patriarchate of Antioch: fithly, for the Muscovian, Russian, Armenian, Syrian, and Nestorian churches: sixthly, for the Maronist, Mingrelian, Georgian, Cyprian, Anaxean; Cephalonian, Zacinthian, and Colchian churches: seventhly, for the churches of the Isles of Ithaica, Micone, Milo and Cheos: eighthly, for those in Cis, Grand Cairo, Eameaziin, Ispahan, Damascus, Diabekea, &c. and for the patriarch of the Coftics.

Since the blasphemous doctrine of Calvin against the real presence, and other heretical opinions of protestants began to be held among those eastern christians, they for remedy against them composed a large confession of their faith under the title of Bouclier de la foi orthodoxe ou apologie &c. that is, The shield of the orthodox faith, or an apology against Calvinistic heretics, who accuse the eastern church of agreeing with them in their doctrine respecting God and divine things; composed by the synod of Jerusalem under the patriarch Doritheus. "It must then be understood," say they towards the end of the prologue to this apology, "that these heretics, being ignorant of the opinions of the oriental church respecting God and divine things, nevertheless accuse it of agreeing with

them in doctrine in order thereby to deceive the ignorant." "The eastern church," continue they, "admits of no other doctrine than the word of God explained by the holy fathers, and by the traditions which the apostles have left and the fathers have preserved down to us. Whereas these heretics, adhering as usual to their own opinions, are deaf to the truth and will not return to the right way. We will, for the sake of brevity omit the passages of scripture and the holy fathers on this point, and will simply state what has lately occurred respecting it. Fifty years after the death of Luther, Martin Crusius and other learned German Lutherans sent the articles of their heresy to the patriarch, who then governed the church of Constantinople, to discover, as they said, whether their doctrine agreed with that of the oriental The celebrated prelate thrice wrote to them, having composed discourses, or rather dogmatical treatises, against them, wherein he refuted all their heresies in an orthodox and theological manner, and explained to them all the opinions that have been held from the beginning in the eastern church. But to all they paid no regard, as they had forsaken the paths of piety." The book was printed in Greek and Latin at Wittemberg, in the year 1584. In it we find the following question concerning the blessed eucharist.

"Question 106, What is the third sacrament? It is the holy cucharist, that is, the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, under appearances of bread and wine; Jesus Christ himself being truly, properly, and really present.

In the first place, in the following question, the priest should call to mind that he must have such an intention that the true substance itself of bread and the substance of wine is changed into the very body and blood of Christ, by the opera-

tion of the Holy Ghost, which he invocates at that moment of time that he may perfect this mystery by prayer and saying; send thy holy Spirit into us, and into these gifts set before us, and make this bread the precious body of thy Christ, and that which is in the chalice the precious blood of thy Christ, changing them by the Holy Ghost. At the same time, by these words, transubstantiation (μετεσιωσις) is effected, and the bread is changed into the true body of Christ, the species alone remaining visible; and this is done according to divine appointment, for two reasons: first, that we may not see the body of Christ with our eyes, but that we may believe that it is present from these words of Christ our Lord, this is my body, this is my blood, rather than perceive it by our senses; seeing that for this our faith he promised us beatitude, saving: Blessed are they who see not and yet believe. Secondly, because human nature has a horror to eat raw flesh, and yet seeing that we ought to be united to Christ our Lord by the communication of the flesh of our Lord Jesus, and of the blood of Christ, that we might not have any horror or aversion for it, our Lord has so constituted it as to give us his flesh to eat, and his blood to drink, under the species or forms of bread and wine. Concerning which St. John Damascen, and St. Gregory of Nyssa have spoken largely."

"Concerning the honour which ought to be rendered to these mysteries, it ought to be the same as that which is given to Christ himself, so that, as St. Peter, speaking for the rest of the apostles, said: Thou art Christ the Son of the living God, so we also worshipping him with sovereign worship (latria) ought to say, I believe, Lord, and confess that thou art the Son of the living God. And this mystery is also a sacrifice offered for the living and for the dead, who are

departed in hope of the resurrection, which sacrifice will not cease till the last judgment." And a little after: "this mystery is propitiatory

for the living and the dead."

This I have shewn you that the faith of the four great patriarchs of the east, and the churches under their jurisdiction, agrees in this great article of the real presence with the church of Rome. And, that the same faith has been held and believed in the church of God in all ages since our blessed Saviour instituted this adorable mystery, is also evident from the writings of the holy fathers above mentioned and in every age since.

I will shew, moreover, that the primitive fathers considered it as a propitiatory sacrifice for the living and for the dead in what follows concerning

prayer for the dead.

The Son of God having spoken it, the church of God in all ages having taught and believed it, and it being also at this present day the universal faith of all christendom, let him who denies or disbelieves it, remember that without faith it is impossible to please God; let him remember that Christ says; he who will not hear the church is to be accounted as a heathen and a publican. Let him further remember that our Saviour says (St. Mark) he that believeth not shall be damned. In a word, let him remember what is said in the Athanasian creed; "Whosoever holds not the catholic faith whole and undefiled he shall perish eternally."

May God, in his mercy, endue with true faith

all those who want it.

LIMBO, purgatory and prayers for the dead, proved from holy scripture and the primitive fathers.

Limbo is that place where the patriarchs, prophets, and holy saints of the old testament re-

mained till the coming of Christ.

None ever entered into heaven before our blessed Redeemer had, by his death upon the cross. satisfied for the sins of Adam, and all his posterity. Nor did any one ascend thither unto the glorious vision of God till the Son of God, by his triumphant ascension, had first opened the eternal gates of heaven, which Adam, by his sin, had shut against mankind. This is evident from St. Paul in his epistle to the Hebrews, chap. 9, where. he tells us, "the way of the holiest was not made manifest, while the former tabernacle was stand-ing. But, Christ being come, the high priest of good things, by his own blood once entered into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemp-tion for us. He is the mediator of the new testament, that, by means of his death (for the redemption of the prevarieations which were under the first testament) they that are called may receive the promise of eternal inheritance. For, where a testament is, there must be the death of the testator: for a testament is of force after men are dead, otherwise it is of no strength at all, while the testator is living. Without shedding of blood there is no remission. Christ is not entered into the holy places made by hands, which are figures of the true, but into heaven itself, now to appear before the face of God for us. From which words of the Holy Ghost speaking by the apostle you see it is evident, that, though the promise of eternal inheritance was made to those of the old testament, yet it was

not fulfilled nor of any force till the death of Christ, the testator. For, during the old testament, the way of the holiest, that is, the way to heaven, was not manifested, nor made open. Nor did any ever appear before the face of God, till Christ, the mediator of the new testament, having by his blood purchased eternal redemption for us, entered into the holy of holies, into heaven itself, there first of all to appear before the face of God for us; when, having reconciled mankind to his Father, those of the old testament then received the eternal inheritance, which had been promised them. Thus he was, the first fruits of them that sleep: the first born of the dead. None before him was found worthy to open the seals and read the book. It was to him the eternal gates were first opened, according to the prophet: Lift up your gates ye princes, and be ye lifted up, O eternal gates, and the king of

glory shall enter in.

Those holy souls of the old testament, to whom the gates of heaven till that time were shut, Christ led triumphantly with him into heaven, as St. Paul testifies, saying, He ascended on high, and led captivity captive, and gave gifts to men. Now that he ascended, what was it but that he descended into the lower parts of the earth? that is, he descended into those lower parts of the earth, where those holy captives were detained in expectation of his coming; and from thence he released them out of their long captivity, and this the holy Ghost foretold by the prophet, saying: In the blood of thy testament thou hast led forth thy prisoners out of the lake, in which there is no water; and proclaimed liberty to the captives, opening the prison to them that were bound or shut The place of the fathers of the old testament, which St. Paul calls the lower part of the earth, and these prophets, a lake or prison, is by

our Saviour called also the heart of the earth, St. Matt. 12: and in another place Abraham's bosom; and, when he was to descend into it himself, he then styled it by the name of paradise, saying to the thief on the cross: This day thou shalt be with me in paradise. And well, indeed, might be give it this delightful title when all in it were to be made happy by the presence of the Son of God, whom they had so long expected; for, by his divine presence, what was before their hell is now their paradise. And, indeed, in many places in scripture it is called also by the word hell, as in Genesis chap. 34, where Jacob says: I will go down into hell unto my son in mourning: and Psalm, 16. Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell: and Psalm, 80. Thou, Lord, hast brought my soul out of hell: Acts chap. 2. God hath raised him up, loosing the sorrows of hell: and in our creed we believe, "he descended into hell."

By the word hell in several other places must not be thought, that the hell of the damned is meant: nor can any such expressions be spoken of that terrible place of torments, because from that hell of the damned the prisoners are never freed, the captives never let out, their sorrows never loosed. But, from the other lake or hell, spoken of in the said places, the prisoners were freed and delivered, the captives, released and our Saviour has loosed the sorrows of this hell. In contemplation of which deliverance St. Paul eried out, O death where is thy sting? O hell where is thy victory? It is, therefore, clear from holy seripture, that our Saviour descended into that place below, from thence to deliver the souls of those of the old testament therein detained; and in this sense the primitive fathers always understood the said texts of Christ's descent into hell, as I will now prove.

St. Irenaus lib: 5, advers Hæres, speaks of it

thus: "During the three days he conversed where the dead were. As the prophecies say of him, he remembered his holy ones who were dead, those who before slept in the land of promise; he descended unto them to fetch them thence and to save them."

Tertullian lib 4, advers: Marcion: chap. 34, has the same sense, saying, "I know that the bosom of Abraham was not a heavenly place, but only the higher hell or the upper part of hell."

St. Chrysostom concerning that place of Isaiah, I will break down the brazen gates and I will bruise the iron bars in pieces, says: "so the prophet calls hell, for, though it was hell, nevertheless it contained the holy souls and precious vessels, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. He descended into hell that the souls which were there might be released." See Homilia quod Christus sit Deus.

St. Augustine upon these words of Psalm 85; Thou hast delivered my soul from the lower hell, says, that "the lower hell is where the damned are tormented; the higher hell is where the souls of the just remained." This is sufficient for the defence of that catholic doctrine concerning Limbo, or that place from which our Saviour released

the fathers of the old testament.

There is also a place of temporal punishment after death for such souls as depart this life in a less degree of perfection than is requisite for their immediate entrance into the glory of God. In this place they are purged, cleansed and purified from all impurity of their venial sins and imperfections, with which they are stained at their departure hence; for, as the holy text says, nothing unclean can see the face of God. The purgation or purifying of the soul is by the catholic church called purgatory.

To this those words of our Saviour, St. Matt. chapter 12, have relation: Whosoever speaketh

against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, nor in the world to come; and St. Augustine explains them in this manner; "some there are," says he, "who, at the day of the resurrection, shall find mercy after they have suffered such pains as the souls of the departed suffer, that they be not cast into eternal fire, otherwise it could not in any true sense be said, that some sins are neither forgiven in this world, nor in the world to come, if there were not some who, not having obtained pardon in this life might nevertheless obtain remission in the next."

Besides our Saviour's descent into limbo, where the patriarchs, the prophets, and other perfect souls were, he also went and preached to those spirits who had been incredulous in the days of Noah. St. Peter tells us, 1 Epis. chap. 3, verses 18, and 19: Being put to death in the flesh, but quickened in the spirit, in which (spirit) he also went and preached to the spirits in prison, who had been incredulous some time in the days of Noah, when the ark was building, amongst which few, that is, eight souls were saved by water. By this text it is evident that there was a prison, or place, in which those souls were detained from the time of the flood to that of our Saviour's descent. To this prison as well as to limbo, St. Peter seems to allude, Acts, chap. 2, when he says of Christ, he loosed the pains of hell. These words, were saved by water, spoken of the persons in the ark, seem to signify that the other disobedient, who would not believe Noah that the flood would come, were saved by fire; for, as St. Peter here uses the expression of being saved by water, so does St. Paul also, Ep. 1. Cor. chap. 3, make use of this other expression of being saved by fire, in relation to those who are to be tried by fire in the next life.

And, indeed, St. Paul's words are so clear and express concerning a fiery trial, or purgatory, in

the next life, for those who die in an imperfect state, that it is neither easy nor natural to put any other interpretation to them. They are these: 1 Corinth. chap. 3. If any build upon this foundation gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay or stubble, every man's work shall be made manifest, for the day shall declare it because it shall be revealed by fire. And the fire shall try every man's work, of what sort it is. If any man's work abide, which he built thereupon, he shall receive a reward. If any man's work shall be burnt, he shall suffer loss, but he himself shall be saved yet so as by fire. The ancients have understood St. Paul to speak here of purgatory, or the fiery purification of souls after their departure out of this life.

Origen, who lived at the end of the second century and the beginning of the third, in his twelfth homily upon the text, writes thus; "What expectest thou after thy death, if upon thy foundation, which is Jesus Christ, thou buildest not only gold; silver, and precious stones, but also, wood, hay, and stubble? wilt thou, with thy wood, hay, and stubble, enter into the holy places and defile the kingdom of God? Or wilt thou, on account of thy wood and stubble, stay without, and so lose the reward of thy gold, silver and precious stones? There is no reason for either. What follows, then, but to have fire put to thy wood to consume or burn out thy wood, hay and stuble, that afterwards thou mayst receive the reward of thy better works."

St. Jerom in comment: Isaiæ ult. cap. and in Ezechiel chap. 1. "Let us," says he, "as becomes our frailty, ery out; Lord, chastise me not in thy fury nor correct me in thy wrath; for, as we believe in the eternal damnation and torments of the devil, with the forsaken and wicked sort, who said in their hearts, there is no God, so we hold that a more moderate sentence mixed with mercy

shall be pronounced upon sinners and bad men, being christians, whose words are purged by fire."

St. Ambrose in 1 ep. Cor. chap. 3, says; "the apostles declared, that such a one shall be saved hereafter, but yet he must suffer the pains of fire, that, being purged by that fire, he may be saved, and not, as the unfaithful, be eternally tormented in hell." This great doctor and holy saint in precat. præpara. ad missam, prays thus; "if thou, O Lord, reserve any thing in me to be revenged in the next life, I humbly beg of thee, not to leave me to the power of wicked spirits whilst thou cleanest away

my sins by the pains of purgatory."

St. Augustine serm. 3 in 103 Psalm, writes thus; "If any man build upon this foundation wood, hay and stubble, that is to say, if he erect worldly affections upon the ground work of his faith, yet, if Christ be in the foundation and possess the chiefest place in his heart, so that nothing be prefered before, such an one may burn withal; for the fiery furnance shall come and burn up the hay, wood, and stubble, but yet he, says the apostle, shall be saved yet so has by fire. And in lib de falsa et vera pænitentia. "He, who deferred the fruits of his repentance till the next life, must be purged or cleansed in the fire of purgatory, and this fire, though not eternal, yet it surpasses in its pains all the torments of this life. Never was any torment in this life found so painful, &c. Let every man so correct his own faults in this life, that after death there may be no need of his suffering such bitter torments." In lib. 21 de civitate Dei. cap. 13: "Some," says he, "suffer temporary pains in this life only, others after death, and others both now and after their death; but yet they suffer them before that severe and last judgment, for all those, who after death sustain temporal pains, come not unto those eternal pains, which follows these after the last judgment; for what

is not forgiven to some, in this life, is remitted in the next, that they may not be punished with the eternal pains of the life to come." Again in lib. 21 de civitate Dei cap. 24. "Those," says he, "who are regenerated in Christ, yet have not lived so ill in the body as to be accounted unworthy of mercy, nor so well as to be found not to stand in need of such mercy, it is certain that such men, being purified by temporal pains, which their souls suffer before the day of judgment, shall not, after they have received their bodies, be again committed to the torments of eternal fire." And again lib. 22, chap. 9, "the souls of the faithful departed are not severed or divided from the church, which is already the kingdom of Christ, for, if they were, there should be no memorial kept for them at the altar in the communion of the body of Christ." Thus writes that admirable doctor and father of the church, the holy St. Augustine.

Eusebius Emisenus, Hom. 3, de epiphania, says; "those who, deserving temporal pains and to whom that saying of our Lord's, they shall not come out till they have paid the last farthing, is especially directed, must pass the fiery flood through horrible fords of scalding waves, whereof the prophet speaks when he says; a fiery stream ran before his facc. The time of passage must be measured according to the heinousness of the sin: the just discipline of that flame shall take vengeance according to the growth of our sins and as far as our folly extended in wickedness, so far this punishment wisely extends. For, as the divine word compares man's soul to a brazen pot, saying, set the pot empty over the coals till the brass thereof become hot; so there you shall see perjury, anger, malice, and vain desires, which infect the purity of man's noble nature, sweat out. There the pewter and lead of divers passions, which defiled the fine gold of the image of God,

shall be consumed; all which in our lives might have easily been wiped away by alms, prayer and tears. Such a strict account will he keep with man, who for man's sake gave himself to death, and being transfixed with nails has also fixed the dominions of death."

So much for the testimony of the primitive fathers, and catholic church in their times, believing and teaching this doctrine of purgatory. I shall further shew you that it was the custom and practice of the church, in those first ages, to pray for the dead, and to offer for their souls the most holy sacrifice of the body and blood of Christ in the mass, which they believed to be a propitiatory sacrifice for the dead as well as for the living.

Tertullian in Corona militis says of the church in his time, which was in the second century; "They offered sacrifices for the dead on their anniversary days." And in Exhor. Castitatis he says, "Call to thy remembrance for whose soul thou prayest, and in whose behalf thou makest thy annual oblations." Again lib. de monogamia, cap. 10, speaking of widows praying for their deceased husbands he says: "she prays for the soul of her husband, and in the mean time obtains ease for him, and offers prayers for him on the anniversary day of his departure."

St. Cyprian, lib. 1, ep. 9, has this remarkable passage concerning their refusal to pray for the soul of one Victor, because he had, contrary to a decree made in a former council, constituted a priest his executor. "The bishops our predecessors, piously considering and handsomely providing, decreed that no brother departing this life should appoint any one of the clergy to be his executor. And, if any did so, neither should any oblation be made for him nor any sacrifice be celebrated for his death, because he deserves not to be named in the prayers of the priest at the altar of God,

who would call away the priests and ministers from the altar to look after worldly things. And, therefore, since Victor, contrary to the order of the late decree made by the priests in the council, has had the boldness to constitute Geminius Faustinus, the priest, his executor, there ought not among you to be any oblation made for his death or any prayer used in the church in his name, that the decree of the priests piously and necessarily made may be observed by us."

St. Ambrose, super obit. Theodosii imperatoris, prays thus for the soul of the emperor; "Give rest, O Lord, to thy good servant Theodosius, even that rest which thou hast prepared for thy holy saints. Let his soul ascend from whence it came. I loved him; therefore I will follow him into the land of the living. I will never forsake him till with tears and prayers I bring that man unto the holy mount of our Lord whither his merits eall him."

The same holy father lib. 2, ep. 8, writing to Faustinus, who too much lamented the death of his sister, says: "I suppose thy sister's case ought not to be so much lamented as delivered by thy prayers. Thou must not contristate her soul by tears, but by oblations commend her to our Lord."

St. Cyril of Jerusalem in Catech. 5, mystagog, writes thus: "We pray for all those who among us are departed this life, believing that great help comes to those souls for whom the oblation of that holy and dreadful sacrifice is offered."

St. Athanasius, Quest. 34, says, "As when the vine in the field flourishes and becomes green, the old wine safely kept in barrels also works new, and as it were ferments again; even so do we suppose that the souls of sinners become joyful and glad, through the benefit of the unbloody host and sacrifice of thanksgiving offered for them; as

as only our God knows and has ordained, who exercises his power over the living and the dead."

St. Chrysostom Hom 3 in ep. ad Philip: and in Hom. 69 ad populum Antioch: says: "It is not in vain that the apostles have decreed that, in the celebration of the adorable mysteries, memory should be made of those who are departed this life; for they knew that great profit would arise to them. For the whole congregation lifting up their hands to heaven together with the company and choirs of priests and the dreadful sacrifice set before all men, how is it possible but that we should appease God's displeasure by praying for them."

St. Augustine lib. de cura pro mortuis cap 18: "Let us never think," says he, "that any other thing we can do, properly pertains to the relief of the faithful departed for whom we take this care, saving for them what we solemnly celebrate, viz. the sacrifice of the altar, alms-deeds and prayers." Again in Enchirid: "neither is it to be denied," says he, "but that the souls of the dead are relieved by the piety of their living friends, when the sacrifice of our mediator is offered for them, or alms-deeds done in the church."

This holy doctor in his 9th book of confessions says of his mother St. Monica, "that she, at her death, begged of them to make remembrance of her at the altar of our Lord wheresoever they were." Again chap 13 he says: "she desired us to remember her at thy altar, thy altar, O God, at which she constantly attended without one day's intermission, from which she knew was dispensed the holy victim by which was cancelled the hand writing which was against us" &c.

And thus, in the same chapter, he prays for her after her departure: "And now, O God of my heart, I become a petitioner to thee for the sins of my mother: hear me, I beseech thee by that cure of our wounds which hung upon the cross, and

now sitting at thy right hand intercedes for us. I know she dealt mercifully, and from her heart forgave to her debtors their trespasses, do thou likewise remit her her debts, if she also contracted any in those many years she lived after her baptism. Forgive them, O Lord, forgive them, I beseech you, and enter not into judgement, but let mercy rejoice against judgment, because thy words are true and thou hast promised mercy to the merciful. Inspire, O Lord, thy servants, my brethren, thy children, my masters, whom I serve both with my heart and voice and with my pen, that as many of them as shall read these things may remember at thy altar Moniea, thy handand Patricius her husband, from whose bodies thou broughtest me into the world. Let them remember with a charitable devotion these my parents, that what my mother made her last request to me may be more plentifully performed to her by the prayers of many, procured by these my confessions and prayers."

This holy father in Serm. 32 de verbis Apostoli says, "It is not to be doubted that the dead, being more mereifully dealt with than their sins deserved, are helped by the prayers of the holy, by the holy sacrifice and by alms given for their souls. This the universal church observes as the tradition of the fathers, that prayers should be offered up for those who are departed in the communion of the body and blood of Christ, when at that sacrifice they are commemorated in their place, and that it may be remembered that this sacrifice is also offered for them." Again in lib. de cura pro mortuis, chap. 1, "we read," says he, "in the book of the Machabees of sacrifice offered for the dead. But suppose it had never been in the old scripture, vet the authority of the universal church, which is clear in this custom, is of great weight where, in the prayers of the priest poured out to God at his

holy altar, commemoration of the dead has also

its place."

I could bring yet farther testimonies from councils and fathers, in every century, even to the present age; but it is not necessary; for those, who read and seriously consider what has been said, cannot without the greatest obstinacy deny that the doctrines of Limbo, purgatory, prayer and sacrifice for the dead, were the doctrines of the holy fathers and catholic church in the first ages of christianity.

He who, after having seen such undeniable evidence and so many testimonies of undoubted authority both from the holy scriptures and from the holy fathers, yet disbelieves or denies these catholic doctrines, let him consider whether he is not guilty of obstinately impugning a known truth in matters of faith. If he is guilty of this, let him not think himself free from sin against the Holy Ghost, which sin our Saviour says, "shall neither be forgiven in this world, nor in the world to come."

INVOC.4TION of saints and angels, and that they pray to God for us proved from holy scripture and the testimony of the primitive fathers.

Christ, the Son of God, is the sovereign head of the whole church militant and triumphant, and the church is his body. We being many, says St. Paul to the Romans chap. 12, are one body in Christ and every one members one of another. Hence we learn that the mystical body of Christ is composed of many members not separated not divided from one another, so as to have no communication with each other, but all so compact and joined one with another as to make up this one entire and compact body, of which Christ is the head. The same apostle in his 1st. epistle to the Cor. chap. 12, tells us that, God so tempered this body as that there may be no schism in it, but the members might be mutually careful one for another. If any one member suffer, all the other members suffer with it. Our Saviour assures us, Luke chap. 15, that there is more joy in heaven over one sinner doing penance

than over ninety-nine just. From all which is clearly gathered, that that part of this mystical body which is now in heaven, is not so divided from this part on earth, as either to be ignorant of it, or not be helpful to it: but, on the contrary, those in heaven, being still a part and members with us in the same body, do take care of us as we do of one another, and rejoice at our repentance and the good that happens to us. Consequently, as we in this life assist and pray for one another, so they likewise in heaven are helpful to us on earth by their prayers and intercession to God for us, and this is evident from their rejoicing at our repentance; for, what they rejoice at when it happens, they certainly desire to come to pass before it happens, otherwise, there would be no rejoicing at it when it comes to pass; and, if they desire it, they pray for it; for the very desire itself that it may come to pass is actually praying or supplicating that it may so happen. Seeing, then, that the saints or angels in heaven pray for us, as we, also, on earth do for one another, we may, for the same reason, desire them to pray for us as we desire and beg others here to pray for us. It is evident in St. Paul's epistle, that, when on earth, he prayed for his fellow members and desired them also to pray for him; why, then, should we not believe that he prays for us now when he is in heaven? We cannot imagine,

that his charity and good will towards us is lessened by his now being in glory, but rather that it is much more increased. Again, if it was lawful to beg St. Paul's prayers when on earth, why not the same also now that he is in heaven, especially seeing he is not only still a fellow-member with us in the same body, but in a much more exalted and excellent state than before, and, consequently, neither less willing to pray for us nor his prayers less effectual, but rather a great deal more, as he is now confirmed in grace and in the clear vision and glory of God, and, therefore, doubtless, when he considers and experiences his own felicity, he must still be more desirous that we, his brethren and fellow-members, should enjoy the same.

We see in many places of the old testament, how solicitous, viligant and careful the angels of God were for the good of the faithful; and St. Paul in the new testament says: "They are all ministering spirits sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation. Our Saviour, St. Matt. chap. 18 ver. 13 calls them our angels, signifying that they take eare of us and represent our afflictions before his Father: take heed you dispise not one of these little ones, for I say unto you. that their angels see the face of my Father who is in

heaven.

St. Jerom upon this place says, "it is a great dignity and wonderful benefit, that every one has from his birth an angel for his keeper or guardian against the wicked before the face of God. St. Augustine de civitate lib. 11, cap 13, says: "the angels will continue for eternity, so they will also rest with facility, for they help us without difficulty." St. Basil lib. 3, contra Eunom: proves from many places of holy scripture that every one has an angel as a guardian and pastor directing his life. St. Cyril of Alexandria lib. 4, contra Ju-

lian: shewing how God useth the ministry of holy angels for man's salvation, saith; "these angels drive away hurtful wild beasts from us and rescue those, whom they seize, from their fury and cruelty, and teach whatsoever is laudible to make our passage free and undisturbed, when with us they glo-

rify our sovereign God."

We read in the Acts of the apostles how St. Peter was delivered from his chains and imprisonment by an angel, and when it seemed incredible to those in Mary's house, that he should be freed, they said, it is his angel; which they could not have done had they not held and believed that he had his particular or proper angel. If proper angels," says St. Chrysostom "be deputed to such only who have charge of their own lives, as one of the just (meaning Jacob) said, the angel who delivered me from my youth, much more are supernatural spirits at hand to help them, unto whom the charge and burden of the world is committed."

Seeing, then, that God has deputed them for our helpers and guardians, and sent them to minister to us for our eternal good, why may we not seasonably and lawfully beg their assistance, as ministering spirits under God, and desire them to pray to God for us.

The patriarch Jacob, Genesis 48, when he blessed the two sons of Joseph, did not hesitate to desire his own angel guardian to bless them, saying, The angel, who delivers me from all evils, bless these children. Here we see that Jacob both owns himself to have been delivered by an angel, and also invocates the same angel to bless his grandsons. So also, when he wrestled with an angel, he desired the angel to bless him. Concerning which the prophet Osec says, He had power over the angel and prevailed: he wept and made supplication to him (or as another expression has it) he wept

and prayed to him. If it is lawful for us to supplicate or pray to the angels, so also to invocate the saints; for our Saviour tells us the saints are as angels in heaven; and it is certain, that it has been the practice and custom of christians in all ages to desire the saints and angels in heaven to pray to God for us. The primitive fathers are clear and undeniable as to this doctrine, as shall be more fully shewn hereafter. And it is the doctrine of catholic church of this day, as it is recorded in the council of Trent, Sess: 25, which teaches that "it is good and profitable for christians humbly to invocate the saints and to have recourse to their prayers and assistance, whereby to obtain benefits of God by his Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, who is our Redeemer and Saviour."

But here perhaps it may be objected, that our making the saints and angels intercessors for us is derogatory to the mediation of Christ our advocate,

Those, who make this objection, are to understand, that we do not make the saints and angels, or men on earth, our advocates in the sense in which Christ is our advocate. To Christ, our advocate, it only belongs and agrees to procure mercy for us before the face of God by the general ransom, price, and payment of his blood for our redemption; he being, as St. John says, The propitiation for our sins, and not for our sins only but the whole world. In which manner he is our only advocate because our only Redeemer. Hence he alone immediately by and through himself, in his own name, right and merits, confidently acts in our cause before God, our judge, and in this manner procures our pardon, and this is the highest degree of advocation and mediation that can be.

But the saints and angels are not to be thought our advocates and mediators in the sense that Christ, our head, is, who demands all things immediately by his own merits. But they are as secondary intercessors, and as being members of the same mystical body with us under him, our head, who always pray for us in and through him, our Lord, our advocate and our Redeemer. Neither do we desire them to pray for us but always

in and through Jesus Christ, our Lord.

St. Augustine, Tract. in 1 ep. Joan. answered the objection a long time since, in these words "But some will say; do not the saints then pray for us? Do not the bishops, then, or prelates and pastors pray for the people? Yes: mark the scriptures, and you will find that the apostles prayed for the people, and again desired the people to pray for them. And so the head prays for all, and the members for one another." And, that it may not be said there is a difference between the members on earth and those in heaven, he further says, "our Lord Jesus Christ doth yet make intercession for us; all the martyrs, who are with him, pray for us; neither will their intercession cease till we cease our groaning." St. Irenæus lib 3, cap. 33, and lib. 5, says: "The obedient virgin Mary is made the advocate for the disobedient virgin Eve."

The ancient heretic, Vigilantius, was the first remarkable opposer of the faith of the church in this point of the saints' praying for us, and our desiring their intercession. He taught that the souls of the martyrs and other saints were included or shut up in some certain place, so that they could not hear our prayer, nor be present at their tombs and monuments, where the faithful then resorted to celebrate and beg their intercession. But that learned doctor and holy father, St. Jerom, in his book against this heretic strongly refuted his doctrine and proved that the saints and martyrs pray much more for us, now they are in

heaven, than they did when here on earth, and are much sooner heard by God than when they were in the world, and that they can be present when and where they please. "Do you," says he to that heretic, prescribe laws to God? "Do you fetter the apostles, that they may be kept in prison till the day of judgment and be seperated from their Lord, of whom it is written, they follow the Lamb wherever he goes? If the Lamb be in every place, then they, that are with him, must be in every place. If the devil and wicked spirits, ranging abroad in the world with great celerity, are present every where, shall the holy martyrs after shedding their blood be kept close under an altar that they cannot stir from thence?"

St. Augustine de civitate Dei cap. 22, says, "to the good angels appertain the knowledge of corporal and temporal things. It is certain, that they know these temporal and mutual things, because they see the principal causes of them in the word of God, by which the world was made. In another place he says; "when the angels hear, God hears in them as in his true temples, not made with hands; so also in all his saints, his commands, which are done temporally, are seen in his eternal laws. And now we see in enigma; but then, when in heaven, we shall see him face to face, as the angels see, who also are our angels &c."

We read in the prophet Daniel how the angel endeavoured to obtain the deliverance of the Jews from their captivity, and that, when the angel of Daniel could not prevail, Michael, the archangel, called one of the chief princes to come to his aid. Which is to be understood that Michael the chief angel, assisted with his prayers or joined his prayers to that of the angel who prayed and offered up Daniel's prayers to God for the deliverance of the Jews. Fear not Daniel, said the angel, for from the first day, on which thou didst set thy mind to under-

stand and to chasten thyself before thy God, thy words were heard, and I am come for thy words: which signifies that he was come to offer up Daniel's prayers to God. And so also the angel said to Tobias chap. 12, ver. 12 "when thou didst pray with tears, I offered thy prayers to God. So also in Revel. chap. 5. "The four beasts and four and twenty elders fell down before the Lumb, having every one of them harps and golden vials full of odors, which are the prayers of the saints. And chap. 8. Another angel came and stood before the altar having a golden eensor, and there was given unto him much incense that he should offer of the prayers of all saints upon the golden altar, which is before the throne of God. And the smoke of the incense of the prayers of the saints ascended up before God from the hand of the angel. From which text it is clear that the four evangelists signified by the four beasts, and also the holy angels offer up to God the prayers of the church militant or faithful on the earth, called here and in other places of scripture, the saints. We read also in the prophet Zachary how the angel prayed for Jerusalem and the cities of Juda in these words: O Lord of hosts, how long wilt thou not have mercy on Jerusalem and the cities of Juda, against which thou hast had indignation these threeseore and ten years. And the Lord answered the angel with good words, saying, I am returned to Jerusalem with mercy and my house shall be built Where we see that both the angel praved for them, and God heard his prayers and granted what he prayed for.

That invocation or prayer to saints was the doctrine and practice of the primitive church, is clearly evident from almost innumerable testimonies of the holy fathers of the first ages.

St. Basil, in his homily upon the forty martyrs, tells his auditors that " in the church of the forty martyrs they have the forty to pray for them."
"He, who is any ways," says he, "with grief, addresses himself to those martyrs: again, he who is at ease prays to them; the one that he may be freed from evils, the other that his prosperity may continue. Here a pious mother, praying for the children, is accepted or heard; as also asking a safe return for her husband when he is on a journey, or health for him in sickness. Let us, therefore, pour forth our prayers with these holy martyrs."

St. Gregory Nazianzen in Orat. in Cyprianum, prays thus to St. Cyprian: "look down upon us from on high and direct our words and life." And in the same oration he records it as an act of devotion in St: Justina, that, to free herself from the snares of satan, she called upon the blessed virgin Mary to help and succour her."

St. Athanasius, in serm: de sancta Deipara, prays thus to the blessed virgin: "give ear to our prayers and forget not thy people. O Lady, O queen, and mother of God, intercede for us. To thee we cry; be mindful of us, O sacred virgin."

St. Gregory of Nyssa in in orat: sancti Theodori, circa finem, thus suplicates St. Theodore for delivery from the invasion of the Scythians. "Intercede, and pray to our Lord for our country. As a soldier, fight for us, and use that liberty of speaking for us, thy fellow servants, as becomes a martyr. But, if there be yet greater intercession requisite and more foreible prayer, do thou oblige the whole choir of thy brother martyrs, and pray altogether for us."

St. Jerom in epitaph: Paulæ eries out thus to saint Paula after her death; "Help me, O Paula,

in my old age with thy prayers."

Rufinus Hist. eccles. lib. 2. eap. 33, writes of the emperor Theodosius that he went to visit the sepulchres of the martyrs, accompanied by all the

clergy and people, and prostrate before their ashes

implored aid by their intercession.

St. Chrysostom hom. 26, in 2 ep. Cor. says, he besought the saints to be his patrons and advocates with God.

St. Ambrose, lib. de Viduis says of the angels, that "they are to be supplicated for us, who are

given us for our protectors"

St. Augustine, lib. de cura pro. mortuis, cap. 4 and 5, says, that "the christians of his time not only recommended the souls of their deceased friends to God, but also to the martyrs, as their patrons, to be helped by them." And this he gives for the reason why they desired to have their bodies buried near the shrines or sepulchres of the martyrs, viz. "that the memory of the place where they were buried might excite their friends to recommend them to those very saints by their prayers." In lib. contra Faust: "the christians," says he, "celebrated the memories of the martyrs with religious solemnity, not only to excite their friends to the imitation of their virtues, but also, to be partakers of their merits and to obtain help by their prayers." Again in lib. 7. Bapt. con. Donat cap 1, he himself prays to St. Cyprian, "Let holy Cyprian help us by his prayers." Read his 22 book and 6th chapter, de civitate Dci, where he treats of the many miracles done in his time at the tombs and the reliques of the martyrs, particularly of St. Stephen, St. Gervase and St. Protase.

Eusebius, lib. 13 Præpara Evangel. "These things," says he, "we daily do, that honouring the friends of God, who are the soldiers of true piety, we go also to their monuments and make our prayers to them, as to the holy men, by whose intercession to God we know ourselves to be greatly assisted."

Theodoret, lib. de curat. Græcor, says; "the

temples of the martyrs are conspicious and illustrious, both for their greatness and beauty: nor do we frequent them only once, or twice, or five times a year; but we celebrate frequent assemblies in them and often sing praises every day to the Lord of these martyrs. Those who are in good health beg of the martyrs the continuance of it. and such as are afflicted with any disease beg to be healed; those who are barren pray that they may have children, and those who have children beg that they may be preserved to them. In like manner, those who travel desire the martyrs to be their companions, or rather the guides of their journey, and those who return safe, return also to give thanks for the benefits they received, not that they imagine they go to god's, but they be eech and pray to the martyrs of God, as heavenly men, to be intercessors for them to him, knowing that such as piously and faithfully pray to them obtain their desires. The donaries, when they pay their vows, are witnesses of the evident testimonies of their recovered health: for some hang up the resemblances of eyes, others of hands, others of feet, made of gold or silver, which their Lord, how small or vile the gifts may be, disdains not most graciously to accept measuring the gift by the ability of the giver. These donaries or gifts, therefore, being exposed to the sight of all men and brought by those who have obtained their health, are most certain signs of the cure of diseases. These, I say, shew the virtues of the martyrs who lie buried there; and the virtues of the martyrs declare the God whom they worshipped to be the true God."

This much is sufficient to shew those who deny this doctrine, that it was the practise and custom of the catholic church, in these first ages, as well as now, to invocate and pray to the saints, to make intercession for them to God, that it was the faith and constant belief of those primitive christians and holy fathers, that the saints and angels in heaven did intercede and pray to God for them. And this is owned to have been held and taught by the primitive fathers and the church in their times even by the most learned protestants themselves. For example, Calvin in his *Institutions book* 3, *chap.* 20, aeknowledges that it was the custom at that time to say: "Holy Mary, and holy Peter, pray for us."

Dr. Forbes, first bishop of Edinburgh, in Consid. modest. ch. 3, page 311, speaking of the above cited words of St. Basil, says: "If St. Basil had not approved of this practise of the people, he would never have proposed an example to be imi-

tated."

Dr. Burnet, now bishop of Sarum, as he styles himself in his Exposition of the thirty-nine articles of the church of England, page 245, article 22, says, "that "St. Augustine doubted not but that men were much the better for the prayers of the martyrs." And page 244, "St. Basil and the other fathers, who so often mention the going to their memories, do plainly insinuate that the martyrs are present and hear themselves called upon. This made their invocation look like another man's desiring the assistance of another good man's prayers." This is enough, for we pray to the saints in heaven in no other manner and in no other sense than when we pray to our fellow members on earth, that is, we desire both to pray to God for us.

Mr. Thorndike, that learned and ingenious protestant writer, epil. part 3, page 358, says, "it is plain, that the lights, both of the Greek and the Latin church, Basil, Gregory, Nazianzen, Gregory of Nyssa, Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine, Chrysostom, both Cyrils, Theodoret, Fulgentius, St. Gregory the great, Leo, more, or rather all, after that time have spoken of the saints and desired their assistance."

Seeing, then, that this doctrine of invocation and prayer to saints is so firmly attested by the ancient fathers, those great lights of the church, that even those learned protestants themselves are thus forced to acknowledge it to have been so anciently practised, and that by the very chiefest fathers of the primitive church, which they cannot but own for the very lights thereof, why should this ancient and apostolical tradition be at this day denied or left off?

If, after the reading and consideration of what has been said, there be any one that still disbelieves or denies the truth of this doctrine and condemns the invocation of saints for erroneous, let such an one examine his ereed whether he believes the communion of saints. If he separate himself from them while he is in this, let him never expect admittance into their communion in the world to come.

FINIS.

J. ROBINSON, PRINTER, MANCHESTER.



UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY

Los Angeles

This book is DUE on the last date stamped below.

Form L9-Series 4939		



